NOT
To BE
RE-Bd.

№ 426163

GIVEN BY

Family of the late Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

19
150
1900
952
2850

1. What has brought [illegible] 250, fo
[See p. 159.] [illegible] W. L. G.

2. Who does not feel [illegible]
his country? — [illegible] The slave [illegible]
revolution.

3. Our republicanism w[illegible]
— p. 250. — Vincent & Lovett.

4. Of what value is a [illegible]
in which freedom of speech & the
of petition, are struck down? —
[illegible] Our colored citizens sold [illegible]

5. The Mexican war

6. When have slaveholders [illegible]
for free territory? — "The [illegible]
can east" — "the [illegible]

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

See pages 103, 230, 239, 250, for letters, speeches, &c., of W. L. G.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

Mr. George Thompson rose and said—My excellent friends who have already addressed this meeting, must permit me to say, that though I fully concur in the view they have taken of the momentous question now before us, I nevertheless cannot rise to speak in support of their sentiments, without expressing my deep pain at finding myself in the situation which I at this moment occupy. It has been my honour and privilege to stand in many of the pulpits of Scotland to advocate, in the presence of large audiences, the abolition of slavery. I have also very frequently in those pulpits exposed and denounced the guilty connection subsisting between the churches of the Southern States of America, and the execrable and cruel system of slavery. Wherever I have done this, I have not only had the sympathy of the people, but the approbation and support of the ministers. Not unfrequently I have been specially invited to lecture upon the inconsistency and criminality of the American churches that were connected with slavery, and in all cases found the clergy ready to go with me in my heaviest denunciations of those who, while they called themselves the disciples and the ministers of the Redeemer, were found conniving at the enslavement, body and soul, of those for whom he died. Little did I ever dream that, in the course of my brief life, it would fall to my lot to stand upon a platform in Scotland to arraign those who once joined with me in condemning the blood-guiltiness of the American Churches, for needlessly, gratuitously, without solicitation, and without any temptation but the most sordid and paltry, uniting in Christian fellowship with men who, of all the abettors of slavery in the universe, are the most inexcusable—because the most enlightened. [Cheers.] Sir, this is the third deputation from the Churches of Great Britain to the Christians of America that I have found it my duty to charge with having done injury to the cause of the slave, by their fraternisation of men-stealers and their apologists; and it is in grief I add, that of those three deputations, the one before us to-night has done most harm and has the smallest excuse to offer. [Cheers.] Sir, the frequent mention this evening of the name of one gentleman connected with that deputation, has brought to my mind a circumstance which I consider it proper to make public. In 1834 I presented a friend in Edinburgh with a small volume entitled, "A Picture of American Slavery." It was the work of a gentleman who had been for many years a Presbyterian minister in the southern states of America. It contained an awful and revolting delineation of the utter corruption of the churches connected with slavery. Its accuracy had never been denied, though its author had frequently been in imminent peril of losing his life, as a reward for his faithfulness in drawing aside the curtain which, till the appearance of his book, had veiled the horrors of those painted sepulchres—the Evangelical slaveholding Churches of the United States. Well, Sir, this book was placed in the hands of Dr. Cunningham. [Hear, hear.] After he had read it, he invited me to breakfast with him. Our conversation related solely to the criminality of the American Churches that supported slavery. He told me, distinctly and emphatically, that of all the aspects under which he regarded American slavery, the most affecting, and that which filled him with the deepest horror, was the connection of ministers of the Gospel, and professing Christians, with the soul-destroying system. At that interview he did not hesitate to declare his conviction, that slaveholding and Christianity were incompatible and irreconcileable. [Cheers.] He did more. He expressed his desire to be instrumental in reprinting the work which he had read, for he said that he most earnestly desired that all the Christians of Scotland should be aware of the guilt and turpitude of those in America, who had covered their Christian profession with shame, by participating in the iniquity of slavery. The consequence was, that the little book was reprinted, under the auspices of Dr. Cunningham, and circulated for the information of the people of Scotland, and for the sole and special purpose of rousing their indignation against the hypocrites of America, who, while calling themselves members of the body of Christ, made merchandise of slaves and the souls of men. Here is the book, printed in your own city, with a preface from the pen of Dr. Cunningham. What says he in the preface?—that he felt "he could not do a more important service to the cause of true religion, than to have it printed in a cheap edition, and presented to his fellow-countrymen." What else does he say?—"We are of opinion that all parties will unite in testifying their abhorrence

of the abominations revealed in this book." How does he speak of the acts revealed in this book?—he calls them "*brutal deeds;*" and concludes with these remarkable words:—"The extraordinary facts detailed, especially *that professed ministers of the Gospel in the United States are deeply involved in the fearful guilt and wickedness described in the book,* must make a deep impression on every well-disposed mind in these lands." Such is the preface to Mr. George Bourne's "Picture of Slavery among the Churches of America." What is the motto which Dr. Cunningham prints upon the title-page?—

> ——————"Is there not some chosen curse—
> Some hidden thunder—in the stores of heaven,
> Red with uncommon wrath, to blast the man
> Who gains his fortune from the blood of souls?"

This is an awful motto. Well, what is the entire object of the book, thus reprinted and adopted by Dr. Cunningham, and sent forth with the terrific words upon its title which I have just read? The object is to show, (I quote from the book,) "how this desolating curse (slavery) can be effectually extirpated." And what is the remedy advised by the author, and recommended by Dr. Cunningham? Hear it: "Every slaveholder, peremptorily and without delay, must be excommunicated from the church of God." [Cheers.] "It is of no importance what titles, what office, what station, or what rank the slaveholder may hold, or what apparent virtues or talents he may possess or develope. To all these specious pleas, and to all this anti-christian white-washing, there is a concise, significant and irrefutable reply—He is a *man-stealer!* But, as a man-stealer is the very highest criminal in the judgment of God, and of all rational uncorrupted men, he cannot be a Christian; and, therefore, it is an insult to the Lord Jesus Christ the Head of the church, to record the most notorious criminal as an acceptable member of "the household of faith." [Loud cheers.] Can you wonder, Sir, at the pain, the surprise, the indignation which I feel, on finding that Dr. Cunningham has sought the aid of these man-stealers, to build up the cause of the Free Church of Scotland, and that he now stands forth in the General Assembly of that church, to claim them as Christian brethren, and to rebuke the men who are endeavouring to separate the holy from the vile in the visible Church of Christ? How have the mighty fallen! How has the fine gold become dim! The salt has lost its savour, and is henceforth fit for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. I do not hesitate to declare my conviction, that the conduct of the deputation of the Free Church, while in America, has been as disgraceful as any thing recorded during the last fifty years. [Loud cheers.] Why, sir, I well recollect receiving a requisition, signed by Dr. Cunningham, Dr. Candlish, and others, who are now conspicuous members of the Free Church, to deliver a lecture in the West Church, Edinburgh, on the duty of British Christians in reference to American slavery. [Cheers.] The great building in which we assembled was crowded to overflowing, and I was supported by these gentlemen in my declaration, that it was the duty of the Christians of this country to refuse all intercourse with the professors of Christianity on the other side of the Atlantic, who in any way lent their assistance to the horrid system of slavery. [Cheers.] What have we beheld since? One of these men has crossed the Atlantic, and, instead of bearing a fearless testimony against the abomination of slavery, he has actually linked the Free Church of Scotland to the very worst of the slaveholding churches of America. He has done more. He has brought into the treasury of the Free Church, the fruits of the plunder of the victims, whom the members of those slaveholding churches have robbed of their liberty—robbed of the fruits of their industry—robbed of every privilege that is valuable and dear—and reduced to the condition of horses, and pigs, and dogs. Oh, horrible impiety! Oh, wicked inconsistency! Oh, monstrous and iniquitous union, of light and darkness, Christ and Belial! Ministers and members of Scotland's Free Church, I tell you from this place, that, while you retain in your treasury, one farthing of the money taken from the slaveholders of America, the curse of the slave, and the righteous indignation of the slave's God, are upon you. While you retain that money, the fairest edifice you have reared, is stained with blood. While you retain that money, there is a fly in your pot of ointment, that will make it a stench in the nostrils of all good men. While you retain that money, your gold and your silver are cankered and corrupted, and, as surely as you have taken it, and, by so doing, joined hands with the very worst of the oppressors of the slave, so surely will

your glory depart, until "ICHABOD" will be written upon the walls of those buildings you have erected for the worship of Him, who has said, "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, Hypocrites! for ye tithe mint, and anise, and cummin, but neglect the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith." [Loud cheers.] You must do more than send back the money. You must put on the sackcloth of repentance. You must confess that you have sinned. You must acknowledge that you have allowed yourselves to be driven into an unholy compact with men-stealers, and you must ask forgiveness of those manacled beings, whose stolen wages you permitted to be brought into your treasury. [Cheers.] Do this, and thy light shall break forth as the morning, thine health shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee, the glory of the Lord shall bring up the rear. Oh, the accursed love of gold! Oh, that three thousand pounds should outweigh the claims of three millions of slaves; should strike dumb the eloquent tongues of Scotland's most talented ministers; should corrupt the principles, pervert the judgment, and stifle the sympathies of those, who were once among the most uncompromising of the enemies of slavery! Who does not say, "Perish the gold, and return again the days of honesty and truth and justice." [Cheers.] What a spectacle, to see the delegates of the Free Church wandering about the slave states with padlocks on their lips! to see them holding fellowship with men, who would have hounded on a Lynch-law mob to drag them to the gibbet, if they had preached one sermon against slavery. A person at this meeting has told us that these gentlemen were sent to preach the Gospel, and had nothing to do with slavery. I tell him they did not preach the Gospel. Would that Missionary be called a preacher of the Gospel, who should say not a word against idolatry in India; not a word against Popery in Rome; not a word against the false prophet at Constantinople! but, on the contrary, fellowship the priests of Juggernaut, fellowship the disciples of Ignatius Loyola, fellowship the expounders of the Koran, and hold forth in their temples and mosques, and take gifts from the shrines of their idols, to build churches and pay ministers in this country. [Loud cheering.] Would Nathan have fulfilled his mission, if, when he had told his parable, he had neglected to say "Thou art the man?" [Cheers.] Did Paul so act when he stood on the Hill of Mars, at Athens? Did Christ so act when he overthrew the tables of the money-changers? Did Noah so act when he preached righteousness to an antediluvian world? Did Lot so act in Sodom, or Moses when he beheld the golden calf? The man who, calling himself a minister of the gospel, visits the Southern States without bearing his testimony against slavery, is recreant to the cause he has professed to espouse; and the more so, if his silence is induced by a desire to share with the man-stealer the gains of his iniquity. They preached the Gospel—did they? and in so doing satisfied their consciences! Why then did they leave the Church of Scotland? [Cheers.] They might have preached it till now, and still remained in the church, according to the principles which actuated them in America. They had only to be silent on the subject of the interference of the secular authority in the affairs of the church, and they might have remained. Why the Non-intrusion agitation in Scotland, and the silence of the delegates on the subject of slavery in America? They could find texts enough in Scotland in favour of Non-intrusion, how was it they could find none against slavery when in America? I should like to see the sermons they preached. I should like to see if among their texts could be found these words—"Whoso stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand he shall surely be put to death. Or these—"Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?" Or these—"Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us? Why do we deal treacherously one with another?" Or these—"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." Or these—"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Or these—"Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them." Or these—"Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal." Or these—"The labourer is worthy of his hire." Or these—"Go to now, rich men, weep and howl for the miseries that are coming upon you. The cry of those who have reaped down your fields, whose hire is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and their cry hath entered into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth." [Great cheering.] Think you, my

friends, the ministers of the Free Church took any one of these texts, while gathering up the gold of the Southern States? I tell you, nay. A faithful sermon from either of these texts, would have obtained for him the honours of martyrdom—a martyrdom that would have shed more glory on the Free Church of Scotland, than all her struggles for the Headship of Christ, in his own Church. [Cheers.] Oh, Sir, when I think of the good which these men might have done, and of the evil which they have done; when I contrast the undying fame they might have achieved for themselves, and Scotland's Free Church, with the scandal and infamy they have brought, both upon themselves, and upon that otherwise illustrious body, I feel as if I could weep tears of blood. Do not judge me too harshly for my warmth, or for the strength of my language. Have I not been in America? Have I not laboured in the cause of the slave? Have I not had the honour of suffering somewhat for the slave's sake? Is not my heart knit in strongest sympathy with those who are nobly battling with the demon of oppression? Was it not my mission, for years, to preach the duty which these delegates have neglected? Have I not laboured to effect the very object which they have frustrated? Have I not not addressed public meetings, and synods, and unions, and assemblies in Scotland, upon the duty of non-fellowship with man-stealers? Has not every city, and almost every town, and scores of the churches in Scotland, heard my voice uplifted in denunciation of all communion with slave-owners? Have I not rejoiced over the growing symptoms of a determination to mark the reprobation in which slavery is held in Scotland, by withdrawing from fellowship with the most guilty of those who participate in the iniquity of the system, namely, the professed disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ? Can I here read such speeches as have been delivered by Dr. Cunningham—such articles as have been written in the *Witness*—such letters as have been penned by Dr. Chalmers—such books as have been published by Mr. Lewis—and such atrocious articles as have appeared in the *Scottish Guardian*, without being moved to indignation, and without joining my voice to the voices of those who are at this moment crying—"Send back the money?" Yes, send back the money! Let that be the cry—teach it to your children, that when they see one of Scotland's ministers in the street, they may in infantile accents cry—"Send back the money!" Women of Scotland! let the words become so familiar to you, that you shall in mistake say to those who sit at your table—"Will you please to send back the money?" (Laughter and loud cheers.) Let every city cover its walls with capitals, a foot square in size, "Send back the money." (Cheers.) Inscribe upon the pedestal of John Knox's statue—"Send back the money." (Cheers.) Write upon the tombs of those who died for the solemn league and covenant—"Send back the money." (Cheers.) From the summit of Arthur's Seat, let a banner perpetually float, with this watchword—"Send back the money." (Cheers.) Carve deep into the Salisbury Crags the words "Send back the money." Inscribe on the Calton Hill, in characters that may be seen from St. George's Hall, "Send back the money." (Immense cheering.) Sir, the question which everybody is asking, is, "What will the Free Church Assembly do?" What they will do I cannot say, but I know what they ought to do, and what they will do if they do right. If they listen to the wishes of the vast majority of the people, they will send back the money. If they are sincerely desirous of averting disunion and division, they will send back the money. If they determine to purge their body from the foul stain of slavery and blood, they will send back the money. If they wish to preach the gospel with success, they will send back the money. If they would have the blessing, rather than the curse, of the slave, they will send back the money. If they would secure the favour and blessing of the God who hath said, "I hate robbery for burnt offering," they will send back the money. (Loud cheers.) But if they do not, what is the duty of those who belong to that Church? I answer, come out from such a Church, be separate from it, touch not the unclean thing; wash your own hands in innocency; bear a practical testimony against so gross an act of treason to the cause of humanity, as that of recognising as the ministers and followers of Christ those who trade in men, and make merchandise of souls. Settle it in your minds, that of all the crimes that can be committed, slavery, as practised in the United States, is the worst. It is the sum of all villanies;—it is the violation of every commandment in the decalogue by one act;—it is the usurpation of the rights of God himself;—it is the debasement of man, created in the image of God, to the level of the beast. Does it mend the matter that this horrible crime is committed by a Doctor of Divinity?—Does it diminish the turpitude of the crime, that the victim is dragged by sacerdotal hands to the horns of the altar, and

sacrificed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is slavery more amiable, because practised by those who preach that God hath made of one blood all the nations of men? Sir, my deliberate opinion, formed from a study of this subject during the last fifteen years, is, that slavery would long since have ceased in America, if it had not been upheld by the Christian denominations of that country. [Cheers.] Well, Sir, just when the great religious bodies of that country were awakening to a sense of their duty—just when Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, were taking up the subject of fellowship with slaveholders, and resolving to purge out the leaven of iniquity, the Free Church of Scotland sends out a deputation—that, trampling under their feet all their formerly avowed principles—resisting and despising the most affectionate and earnest remonstrances offered to them on their landing—casting behind their backs the known wishes and opinions of the vast bulk of their constituents—direct their steps to the slave States—partake the hospitalities of slaveholders—sit at tables groaning with delicacies, the plunder of those who were fainting under the lash in the field—lie in luxurious beds, purchased with the money that belonged to the slaves—are waited upon by human beasts of burden—enter churches built by slaves, out of the money of which those slaves had been robbed—preach sermons to recommend the religion of Christ, in pulpits from which they would have been dragged as felons, if they had opened their mouths for the dumb. They call by the name of "dear brethren," men living upon the fruits of the enslavement and degradation of their own church members—they pocket a portion of the fruits of a system of soul murder, concubinage, lewdness, Lynch-law—and having done so, come home to be henceforth the apologists of those with whom they have thus confederated. Verily, they have their reward! They have broken the hearts of the friends of liberty. They have won the regards and esteem of the traffickers in human flesh. Their praises are sounded in the vile pro-slavery newspapers of America. They have done what they could do to sanctify and perpetuate the most horrible system of brutality and murder on the face of the earth. They have given the lie to all those who, before they visited America, had proclaimed the doctrine of "no union with slaveholders." To justify themselves, they have misrepresented and maligned the only persons who are consistently working in the cause of freedom. To cover their own cowardice, they have branded others as fanatics, and enemies to the cause of the slave. And, to reconcile the Free Church of Scotland to all this, they have put £3000 into her treasury. Oh, sir, if every farthing of that three thousand pounds could be made another three thousand pounds, the Free Church should sacrifice it three thousand times over, rather than fix upon herself the deep and damning stain of such a horrid sin, as that of appropriating the wages of blood for the promotion of the cause of Christ. [Loud cheers.] Friends of humanity! Up, rouse ye. Let the Free Church have no rest. I feel sure that you will in the end triumph. The difficulty all lies in the influence which a very few men exert over the rest of their brethren. But for the fear of man, which bringeth a snare, there would be scores in the ensuing Assembly to denounce this covenant with transgressors, into which the deputation has entered. I well know the overawing effect of the presence of the Candlishes, the Cunninghams, and the Chalmerses. Were these men to propose the sending back of the money, the proposition would be hailed with joyful plaudits from all parts of the house; but while they hang by their corrupt and temporising doctrines, their less influential brethren are mute. All honour to the Willises, Greys, and Duncans of the Free Church. [Loud cheers.] I believe, Sir, there are many Willises, Greys, and Duncans, and many in that body, and I fondly trust they will, at the ensuing Assembly, obey God rather than man, and speak out the honest sentiments of their souls. To this Society and its friends I would say, Be ye steadfast and unmovable. The path of duty at the present is most plain. While a penny of the slaveholders' money remains in Scotland, let there be no peace. If there be any in this country who, while calling themselves abolitionists, look with indifference or apathy upon this question, and refuse to lend a helping hand, I beseech such to examine themselves, whether they are really sound in the faith, and to beware lest this struggle should reveal, that they were only abolitionists when they could be such, without the loss of the favour and countenance of the chief priests and elders of the people. Peace is worth much; but it is not worth the sacrifice of principle. It is far too dearly bought, when it costs a man his fidelity to the cause of truth, and of the bleeding slave. To the Free Church, I say—Be wise in time. What you do, do quickly. It is even now almost too late to retrieve your character: but delay may be fatal. Let those

distinguished men, who are for compromising the question, and keeping the money, be assured that the strife is unequal. The people are against them. The spirit of the age is against them. The Word of God, and the Gospel of Christ, are against them. They may contend a little longer, but they must fall at last.

Repent ye, then, and swiftly bring,
Forth from the camp, the accursed thing;
Consign it to remorseless fire—
Watch till the latest spark expire;—
Then, strew its ashes on the wind,
Nor leave an atom wreck behind!

So shall your power and wealth increase—
So shall the FREE CHURCH dwell in peace;
On it the Almighty's glory rest,
And all the land by it be blest.

Mr. Thompson resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.

Mr. WRIGHT proposed a resolution of cordial acknowledgment to the Evangelical Alliance, for having, at their last meeting held at Birmingham, passed a resolution by which slaveholders would not be invited to their meeting, to be held in August next; and recommending to all those bodies whose object is the spread of the Redeemer's Kingdom, to adopt and carry out the same principle; which motion was agreed to by acclamation.

Mr. THOMPSON—Sir, the Committee have intrusted to me a resolution, which it gives me peculiar pleasure to submit to this meeting. It is the intention of a few in this country, who deeply sympathise with the American abolitionists, and who desire to do all in their power to promote the cause of universal emancipation, to meet in London in the month of August next, that they may confer together respecting the best and most effectual means of realising their wishes. At this conference we hope to be favoured with the presence and assistance of some of the most uncompromising friends of abolition from Scotland, from Ireland, from various parts of England, and from the United States. Sir, there is one man without whom such a meeting would scarcely be complete, by whomsoever else it might be attended. That man it is the object of my resolution to invite, and that man is William Lloyd Garrison. [Loud cheers.] Sir, there are many reasons for my individually desiring to see William Lloyd Garrison once again in this country. I long to embrace to my heart a friend and brother, who occupies a place in my most ardent affections. I long to tell him, that though the whispers of falsehood, and the parthian arrows of the envious and bigoted may have done him injury in the estimation of others, they have only made him more dear to me, and more anxious to be identified with him. I want him to revisit these shores, that he may, by his own bright presence, dispel those clouds which the clandestine calumnies of his enemies have raised, to obscure the fair proportions of his pure and beautiful character. Sir, let me once again bear my testimony to the character of William Lloyd Garrison. I have known him for thirteen years. During that time I have studied him deeply. I have seen his soul in his writings. I have seen it poured out in the fulness of confidential correspondence—I have seen it manifested in the hours when a man throws off the disguises he is wont at other times to assume, and appears as he really is—I have seen him in the every day labours of life—I have seen him in the time of danger, when his life was in peril, and in the season of prosperity, when the people shouted Hosannah. I have conversed with him on matters of deepest importance relating both to time and eternity, and have enjoyed, I believe, his unlimited confidence. I have heard the accusations of his enemies, and have investigated both them and the motives in which they originated. I may therefore ask to be admitted a witness, and my solemn, my heartfelt conviction and unbiased testimony is this, that there breathes not a man more worthy the love, the trust, and the esteem of the friends of God and man than William Lloyd Garrison. [Loud cheers.] In the event of Providence permitting us to meet together some time hence, I desire to see him in our midst, that we may be aided by his counsel and cheered by his presence. And oh, I want those who have harboured a hard thought towards this my beloved brother, to know him, to prove him, and then to take him to their hearts and tell him, that they repent that they ever allowed the breath of slander to dim for a moment the lustre of his character in their eyes. [Loud cheers.] Mr. Thompson presented the following resolution:—"That this Meeting cordially sympathize with William Lloyd Garrison and his coadjutors, in their efforts to promote the Abolition of Slavery in America; and that we extend to Mr. Garrison an invitation to visit this kingdom, to cheer us by his presence, and to encourage us by his counsels."

MEMORIAL from the Glasgow Emancipation Society, in public Meeting assembled, to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, regarding Christian Fellowship with Slaveholders, and imploring them to SEND BACK THE MONEY, a large number of those comprising said Meeting being Members of the Free Church.

REVEREND SIRS,

THE object of our Society is the Immediate and Unconditional Abolition of Slavery throughout the World. By Slavery, we mean the act of holding and using MAN as a "Chattel personal," as it is defined by the following law:—"Slaves shall be deemed, held, and reputed to be chattels personal to all intents and purposes whatsoever." Under the liabilities of this law, is every Slave in America held.

To accomplish our humane and Christian object, we rely solely, under the blessing of God, on peaceful, Christian means. We believe that Christ is "the power of God, and the wisdom of God" to take away this sin of Slaveholding from the world—as well as all other sins—but we have no hope that Christianity can ever fulfil its mission, in reference to this monster Sin, while Slaveholders are received in Society, as "respectable, honoured, evangelical Christians."

While we disclaim the intention or wish to dictate to you, or to interfere with your doctrine or discipline, we do claim it as our right, and feel it to be our duty, to memorialise your Reverend Court, touching your position in reference to American Slaveholders.

As men and Christians, we come before you to plead the cause of THREE MILLIONS of our fellow-beings in the United States of America, respecting whose condition the following facts are attested by express statute laws—by the decisions of Courts—by the Executive proceedings of the State and National Governments—by the testimony of ecclesiastical bodies, of different denominations—and by the public sentiment of the whole nation—*i.e.*

To all intents and purposes, they are held and used *as property:*

They are denied the rights of marriage, and are compelled to live in universal concubinage:

They have no protection in their domestic relations and endearments:

All control of parents over their offspring is annihilated; and they must yield them up, as soon as born, to be *branded as property:* and to be reared for the market as mere articles of merchandise:

Children must follow the condition of the MOTHER; and the *Father* of a Slave is never inquired after, or recognised, in Ecclesiastical or Civil Courts:

They are punished with stripes, imprisonment, or death, for teaching their children to read the law of their God:

They are scourged, hung, hunted with bloodhounds, and shot, if they attempt to exchange their ignorance for knowledge; their intellectual, social, and moral degradation for literature, science, and moral elevation; their Slavery for freedom; their heathenism for Christianity and civilization:

They are never allowed to bear witness against their oppressors, in Civil or Ecclesiastical Courts, whatever outrages they may have committed upon them:

They are fed, clothed, reared and disciplined, solely with a view to their value in the market:

They have no being aside from the pecuniary interests of their masters—they are worked as creatures of profit, and profit only—and have no value in the estimation of their owners, except as they add to their wealth:

While conscious of their alliance to God and eternity, and of their "right"—in the language of the late Rev. Dr. ANDREW THOMSON—"to call God their Father and to tread the soil of freedom, because they hope to tread the soil of immortality," they are compelled to grope about amid the dark horrors of Chattelism, feeling after God and eternal life among beasts and creeping things:

Such is the present condition of every American Slave, such are the deeds daily perpetrated by every American Slaveholder.

In 1794, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America adopted, as a part of their discipline, that "all who keep, sell, or buy slaves, are manstealers, guilty of the highest kind of theft, and sinners of the first rank." In 1816, the Gene-

ral Assembly expunged this testimony against Slaveholders. Why? Because, as a member of that body said to it, in 1835—"In the Presbyterian Church, Members, Elders, Ministers, and Doctors of Divinity, are, with both hands, engaged in the unholy traffic in Slaves." And because, as another member declared, no one contradicting, that "three-fourths of all the Presbyterians in the Slave States hold, buy, and sell Slaves, for the sake of gain." During the past year, the Synod of South Carolina, through the agency of their Theological Seminary, seized and sold eight human beings, to get money to educate Presbyterian Ministers.* Last spring, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America decided that American Slavery was in accordance with the spirit and precepts of the Gospel. The Presbyterian Church in the Slave States denies to the enslaved portion of its members the right to "search the Scriptures"—the right to worship their God—the right to teach their children the record of the life and death of Christ. Slave-breeders, Slave-traders, and Slave-holders, as Members, Elders, and Ministers, are admitted to the pulpits and communion of that Church, and to the seats of honour in her Church Courts. These are horrible, but well-known and undenied facts, in relation to that Church and her General Assembly.

To that body, thus composed in part of "manstealers and sinners of the first rank," who "trade in slaves and souls of men," to get money to educate their ministers, you sent delegates, who, though warned and entreated not to do so, and acting in your name, formed an alliance with them, and took their money to build your churches—and you have declared, in the deliverance of your Commission, in 1844, that "all opportunities of drawing closer the bonds of fellowship with them ought to be embraced and improved." In doing these things, you have lent whatever influence you may possess to connect the endeared and venerated name of CHRISTIAN with *Manstealers*, whom the Apostle classes with "murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers."

We come to you in the name of our common God, and in the name of our common Humanity, to ask you, to entreat, to implore you, to "annul this covenant with death and this agreement with hell." Do not, we beseech you, despise and reject our suit—for it is the voice of our Saviour, bought and sold in the persons of his "little ones," calling unto you in the language of mourning and entreaty. By one act, you can exert an influence over the destinies of a great nation, and over the destinies of Three Millions of Slaves in its bosom—victims of its thirst for gold and its lust for power; and earn to yourselves the blessings of those who are ready to perish, the kindly sympathies and respect of all good men, and the approbation of your God.

As your leading men have declared that you cannot give up your fellowship with Slaveholders, while you keep their Money in your Coffers,—money which they gave, with the understanding that you were to receive them to your pulpits and communion, as honest men and Christians; therefore, by the tears and sorrows of Three Millions of Slaves, by the claims of humanity to your love and sympathy, as you value the teachings, the sufferings and death of Christ, by your oft-expressed solicitude for the "Glory," the "Headship," and "Crown Rights" of your Redeemer; by your Veneration for the God of the Oppressed, we entreat you, Reverend Sirs,

SEND BACK THAT MONEY.

Signed, in name and by appointment of the Meeting, this 21st day of April, 1846,

JAMES TURNER, Chairman.

Extract from the *Savannah Republican*, a paper published in Savannah, in the State of Georgia, dated March 3, 1845:—

"Will be sold, on the first Thursday in March, in front of the Court House, in the City of Darien, Georgia, between the legal hours of sale, the following Negro slaves:—*i.e.* Charles, Peggy, Antonett, Davy, September, Maria, Jenny, and Isaac, levied on as the property of Henry T. Hall, to satisfy a mortgage issued out of the M'Intosh Superior Court, in favour of the Board of Directors of the THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, against said Henry T. Hall.—Conditions, cash.

"C. O'Neal,
"Deputy-Sheriff, M.C."

We do not consider it at all necessary again to notice Mr. George Thompson and his compeers, farther than to refer to a very able and spirited pamphlet, just published by Mr. Johnstone, and entitled, "*The Free Church and her Accusers, &c.—a Letter to Mr. George Thompson.*" This pamphlet (we think) *finishes* Mr. Thompson and his friends. We were told that they were to hold meetings every night, in Edinburgh, until the meeting of the General Assembly; but Mr. George Thompson (we learn) is off already to London—*promising to return.* WE DO NOT BELIEVE HE CAN EVER RETURN. We shall give some extracts from the pamphlet in our next; but we recommend every one to procure it and read it at length, for it is most complete and satisfactory.

In the meantime, we here subjoin the representation given of the American "abolitionists" by the celebrated Dr. Channing—a man whose enmity to slavery is well known, and whom Mr. George Thompson justly pronounces to have been "a giant in intellect." Had Dr. Channing witnessed the scenes which have scandalised Scotland within the last ten days, he would, no doubt, have expressed himself in much stronger language; but the following is sufficiently explicit. Dr. Channing says—

"THE ABOLITIONISTS HAVE DONE WRONG, I believe; nor is their wrong to be winked at, *because done fanatically*, or with good intentions; for how much mischief may be wrought with good design! They have fallen into the common error of enthusiasts, that of exaggerating their object of feeling, as if no evil existed but that which they opposed, and as if no guilt could be compared with that of countenancing or upholding it. The tone of their newspapers, as far as I have seen them, has often been *fierce, bitter, and abusive.* Their imaginations have fed on pictures of the cruelty to which the slave is exposed, till they have seemed to think that his abode was perpetually resounding with the lash, and wringing with shrieks of agony; and accordingly, the slaveholder has been held up to execration as a monster of cruelty. I know that many of their publications have been calm, well-considered, and abounding in strong reasoning; but those which have been most widely scattered, and are most adapted to act on the common mind, have had a tone UNFRIENDLY BOTH TO MANNERS AND TO THE SPIRIT OF OUR RELIGION.

"The adoption of the common system of agitation by the Abolitionists *has proved signally unsuccessful.* From the beginning it created alarm in the considerate, and strengthened the sympathies of the free States with the slaveholder. It made converts of a few individuals, *but alienated multitudes. Its influence at the south has been evil without mixture.* It has stirred up bitter passion and a fierce fanaticism, which have shut every ear and every heart against its arguments and persuasions. These effects are the more to be deplored, because the hope of freedom to the slave lies chiefly in the dispositions of his master. The Abolitionist proposed, indeed, to convert the slaveholders; and for this end he approached them with vituperation, and exhausted on them the VOCABULARY OF ABUSE! *And he has reaped as he sowed.* His vehement pleadings for the slaves have been answered by wilder ones from the slaveholder; and, what is worse, deliberate defences of slavery have been sent forth, in the spirit of the dark ages, and in defiance of the moral convictions and feelings of the Christian and civilised world. Thus, with good purposes, nothing seems to have been gained. Perhaps (though I am anxious to repel the thought) SOMETHING HAS BEEN LOST TO THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM AND HUMANITY.

SEND BACK THE DOLLARS.

Not at all. The *Guardian* of Tuesday is particularly fierce on the subject. That eminent Free Church organ rudely attacks "Messrs Buffum, Thompson, & Co.," for presuming to ask back the slavery dollars from their "free" clutches. It calls these able advocates of negro emancipation, low reptiles, "whose mouths are full of Billingsgate," and with whom it would be improper for ministers of the Free Church "to discuss matters of Christian duty!"

Aye, it is unblushingly avowed by this meek and veritable Free Church organ, yclept the *Guardian*, that the receipt of these *slavery* dollars, with all the moral contamination about them, shall be treasured up for the Sustentation Fund of the so-called "*free*" Christian ministers of Scotland! This, then, is a part of their "Christian duty." This is their fine, "free" Christian ethics, spoken of by the *Guardian*, namely, to take lucre from dens of iniquity; yes, and coolly to boast of it; coolly to parade it in their so-called "free" Sustentation statements; and when the poor negro, or his humble advocates, come hither to remonstrate against such atrocity, and loudly, but eloquently, to protest against the shocking traffic in human flesh and blood—against the spoil and horrible gains derivable therefrom, and solemnly beg and beseech these so-called "free" Christian ministers in Scotland to wash their hands clean of it, the latter, instead of doing this, put on surly airs, which they call the essence of Christianity, and they brandish their "free" whips, forsooth, against those who call upon them to disgorge the abominable money; the latter, viz., the *money*, being obviously the Alpha and the Omega of the *Guardian* gang!

But is there a man in all Scotland, whose bosom glows with real liberty or philanthropy, that does not feel his cheek tingle, or his heart beat with indignation, at the bare idea of being associated in bonds of brotherhood with the hardened and remorseless advocates of slavery; those monsters in human form who, to the scandal of Scotland, have now found a niche in the good graces of its so-called "free" divines. And why? For the sake, we repeat, of the *dollars*; yes, the *dollars*, and nothing else. But let the thrilling lines, in our last page, sting them, as we hope they will do to the very quick; and may our free countrymen—free, in the best sense of that noble word—hold no fellowship whatever with such demons—such wolves in sheep's clothing. This is the land of Bruce and Wallace. It is the land of virtuous men and virtuous women. Who amongst us will dare to say success to slavery? Who amongst us would dare to barter away the souls and bodies of his children for any worldly sustentation whatever? The very thought is sickening, if not revolting. The Free Church of Scotland, with all its subtlety—with all its specious gammon, cannot possibly get out of this dilemma. The blood is on its hands. The dollars thence derived are at any rate now wrapt up wilfully and deliberately in its coffers.

"O my soul come not thou into their secret: unto "their assembly mine honour be not thou united: for "in their anger they slew a man, and in their self-will "they digged down a wall." (Genesis 49 chap. 6 verse.)

ABSCONDING AND CHALLENGING.

That hoary-headed hypocrite and very free sinner, the *Guardian*, is now gloating over the donation of dollars from Charleston, and vindicating the gift. Yet it is not difficult to perceive that the *Guardian* is writhing, and gnawing, and gnashing its teeth, in consequence of the lashing it has just met with from George Thompson and his coadjutors in the good and righteous cause of *Slave Emancipation*—the simple name of which must sound horribly to this so-called "free" *Guardian*.

Well, George Thompson has been in Edinburgh this week, with his friends, Buffum and Douglass, lecturing away pretty smartly, we learn, about these notorious slavery dollars, and making terrible havoc in the free camp, leaving the free recipients with scarcely a leg to stand upon.

George Thompson threatened, we also learn, to meet the free brethren in their own free camp, viz., in Canonmills Hall, next week, and to throw down the gauntlet to them *per* the said dollars.

Great consternation prevailed, and does prevail still, we believe, on this very topic in Edinburgh and other places throughout Scotland. It was mooted that Dr Cunningham, who had been in America himself and assisted in carrying home the dollars to the free Mint, was buckling on his armour for a tilt with Thompson in Canonmills. But the *Guardian* of yesterday (Friday) makes the following announcement:—

"We (*Guardian*) were told that they (meaning "Thompson and Douglass, &c.) were to hold "meetings every night in Edinburgh, until the "meeting of the (Free) General Assembly; but "Mr George Thompson, we learn, is off already "to London,—promising to return." And the *Guardian* adds, in large capitals, as follows:—
"WE DO NOT BELIEVE HE CAN EVER RETURN."

The English of that is, that Thompson has ran away, or ABSCONDED like a coward. Is not that the fair and free construction to be put upon it? And the *Guardian* obviously exults in the statement, by printing the above words in its largest type.

Now, then, we step forward, and hereby offer to wager the *Guardian*, or the *Witness* either, conjunctly or severally, *One Thousand good hard silver* (not slavery) DOLLARS, which we shall consign in the shape of genuine gold in the Bank of Scotland, to an equal amount on their part, that not only will Thompson come back, but that he will come back and meet Dr Cunningham, or Dr Chalmers, Begg of Libberton, Lewis of Dundee, M'Naughtan of Paisley, or the Free Church Moderator himself, whoever he may be, to the bargain, face to face, and that George Thompson will discuss this very question with all or any of them, on any free platform in Edinburgh or Glasgow.

Here, then, is a challenge. Is it not made by us explicitly enough? But will the *Guardian* come down with the dust—with the *dollars*, we mean? Aye, there's the rub!

However, if we cannot draw him out with the dollars, we shall at least stick to his skirts with the pen.

Is not this a dainty dish
To set before the Free?

Fifeshire Journal. June 4.

FROM OUR EDINBURGH CORRESPONDENT.

Edinburgh, 2d June, 1846.

THE discussions in the General Assembly which have just terminated present the aspect of a Church under good regulation, and of which it may be said in the language of the prophet—"In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." I was glad to observe that the meetings were but slenderly attended. This is always desirable. Depend on it that a crowded audience is not a good sign of a General Assembly; for people do not collect to witness unity and harmony, courtesy and gentlemanly conduct, in a church court.

The Free Church is covering herself with disgrace in the Irish-money affair, or rather she is allowing the unprincipled Jesuitical doctors who tyrannise over her to throw the odium and the indelible shame of their disgusting sophistry, their contempt of the religion of the Gospel, and their callous disregard of the claims and the calls of humanity, over the whole community, which they have seduced and blindfolded, and are leading to destruction. I need not tell you that amongst the members of no Church that ever existed is freedom of opinion more completely suppressed than it is amongst the Free Church people; and just now there is every reason to believe that the poor enthralled creatures are prevented by their priests from listening to the noble and truly Christian addresses of Mr George Thompson, in which the base quibbling and the audacious blasphemies of the priests are every other night held up to the execration of the Christian community. But wherever they come from, or whatever different Churches they belong to, these meetings are attended by overflowing audiences, and the thousands of the mothers and daughters of Scotland who have listened to the appeals of this magnificent orator—strong in the possession of eloquence of the highest order, and irresistible in the possession of a great and glorious cause—these thousands of mothers and daughters, who have now night after night held up their hands in behalf of their enslaved fellow-creatures, will assuredly carry to the homes and the hearths of thousands of families an inextinguishable hatred of the atrocious system for which the Free Church priests, with the price of innocent blood rattling in their pockets, are now pleading before an outraged and insulted public. They will carry to these homes and hearths an irrepressible zeal in the cause of human liberty, before which the slavish doctrines of the Free Church priests shall perish "as the fire devoureth the stubble and the flame consumeth the chaff." I have referred to the immense attendance of ladies at Mr Thompson's meetings, and not without reason, for in this there is a sign of fearful portent to the fortunes of the Free Church. With regard to the amiable division of the human family to whom I now allude, there is this to be said to their credit, that, except when under the baneful influence of priestcraft, in questions of the heart and feelings, women always decide aright. Hence the desperate efforts now made by the priests to scare them away from the hearing of the truth, by heaping the vilest slanders on the characters of its noblest champions. Let it also not be forgotten that it was mainly by working on the minds of women with all the machinery of priestcraft that the Free Church Doctors succeeded in rearing their fabric of delusion and debasement, just as did the great Free Churchman of Rome, the famous Hildebrand. But when

this influence which they had so lately at command shall desert the priests, and range itself on the side of Christianity, the reaction will be terrible. And it is not in the heart of a mother to hear a fair statement of the claims of the slave—to open her ears to the sighs of the mothers and children doomed to misery in this world, and, as far as the man-stealers in America and their sympathisers the Free Church clergy can do, deprived of salvation in the next—it is not in the heart of a Christian mother to listen to these things without feeling her whole soul rising up in rebellion against the men in America by whom these crimes are directly committed and the detestable doctors of divinity in Scotland, who for the sake of a portion of the gains of guilt, are defending and apologising for this iniquity, and doing all in their power to perpetuate its existence. The great matter will be to get the mothers in the Free Church just for one evening to indulge themselves with a visit to Mr Thompson—just to steal one hour of freedom from the yoke of their hard tyrants the priests—and for one hour to hear the case between the religion of the New Testament and the religion of their priests. They will feel in the exchange all that they might be supposed to feel if they had escaped from under the shadow of the poisonous upas, to rejoice in the free air of their own Scottish mountains. And let the emissaries of the priests revile and calumniate the advocates of humanity as they please, I feel that George Thompson, backed by the Christianity of the land, will prove either the death of the Free Church, or, what I would much more delight to believe, her saviour from a dreadful and fatal career of blood guiltiness. The Free Church, I feel assured, will—I shall not say "SEND BACK THE MONEY," for that is a matter of inferior importance—but will break off her unhappy connection with the infamous and blood-stained Churches of America, or if this alternative — this so much to be desired, so much to be prayed for alternative —is not come to, the Free Church will certainly perish in her own rottenness, and fall into an untimely grave, not merely "unwept, unhonoured, and unsung," but "loaded with the accummulated execrations of mankind."

It is somewhat curious and instructive to observe the present position of the Free Church clergymen in reference to the question of the hush-money. A few years ago these clergymen picked a quarrel with the State and with the courts of the land—to which they placed themselves in opposition—on a question about which it was not easy to excite the people if both sides of it had been fairly and honestly laid before them. In particular, as their strength lay in deluding the softer, and, as a father of the Church who had great experience in dealing with them calls them, "the devout sex;" and as the question of the competing jurisdictions of the civil and the ecclesiastical courts in the country was one peculiarly dry and unexciting in itself, and particularly uninteresting to the minds of ladies, the priests got rid of this difficulty—and simplified the whole question, and made it deeply interesting and intensely exciting—by boldly and plainly representing the matter in dispute as just a battle concerning the rights of the Redeemer of mankind, in which they—the priests—were nobly contending under the standard of the Redeemer; while Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham, the Legislature, and the Court of Session, were leagued together on the side of the world, the flesh, and the devil. Having thus got the matter put into a workable form, and fit to be presented before excitable men and excitable women, they backed their invention with

a force of falsehood and blasphemy, which had till then been unknown in any professedly Christian country. They declared that Cæsar—meaning the Lord Justice-Clerk—had taken away the crown rights of the great Head of the Church. The Rev. William King Tweedie charged all who opposed the projects of the priests with being "engaged in a plot to dethrone the Lord of Glory." When brought before the bars of the courts for breaking the laws, they compared themselves to the Apostles and Prophets persecuted for the worship of God. All these lies and blasphemies did their turn at the time, and the wicked flourished like a green bay tree. But mark the retribution of Heaven!—and let the liar and the blasphemer learn a lesson from it. The hour is now come when the most fearful denunciations of the most dreadful crimes are poured out on the heads of these same priests—with this difference, that while their denunciations were mere words, the denunciations now hurled against them are the thunderbolts of truth. They are now denounced as the men that have sold the Redeemer for three thousand pounds, and as leagued with "a horde of man-stealers—a brotherhood of thieves." They have become a shame and a derision to the people—their crimes are now made ballads of, and sung to filthy tunes; and could they silence the voices of the honest mob, the very stones would cry out against their double-dyed hypocrisy. And most richly have they deserved all that they have yet got, and all that is yet awaiting them.

On Saturday last, Mr Douglas, the late slave, Mr Buffum, and some ladies, visited the Free Assembly, but they could not take their seats quietly and peaceably without being saluted with a hiss from the Free Churchmen, who cannot tolerate Mr Douglas's black skin, though they admire the black hearts of their own priests. At a subsequent period, Mr Thompson appeared amongst the audience; and, during a passage in Dr Cunningham's impudent speech, felt constrained to direct attention to it by calling out "hear, hear." Upon the recognition of that fine powerful voice—a voice that will yet summon the Free Church to death or to surrender—the deluded minions of priestcraft rose in excitement with hissing and hooting, and cries of "put him out, put him out." Such is the freedom of the Free Church! To be sure, the attendant at a dinner party is not allowed to laugh at any story told by any of the entertained, though it were the funniest that ever was told, but is bound to burst with silent laughter, and one who was not a member of the Free Assembly had no right to cry "hear, hear," though he had heard Dr Cunningham proposing to burn Edinburgh. Nevertheless, the crime was pardonable, and would have been pardoned by any assemblage whatever but an assemblage with tortured consciences. It was their own conscious guilt that made the very sound of Mr Thompson's voice terrible to their hearts; and if there be such a thing as a monitor placed within the breasts of the worst of men, the appearance of Mr Douglas in that Assembly must for a moment have struck the doctors as the figure of an accusing angel, who would one day meet them again before a bar—where neither their own base jesuitry, and lies, and equivocations, nor the applause, nor the hisses of their deluded followers, will avail them; and hardened and seared by long practice in setting aside the truth by force of words, as Dr Cunningham is, we believe that at the sound of the "hear, hear" even that vile special pleader must have felt his heart, or that part of his inside which is recognised as the

heart in other people—he must have felt his heart knocking against his ribs, and, for a brief moment at least, conscience must have asserted its controul over his soul.

So much afraid were the Free Assembly of the moral and religious power of Mr Thompson's presence amongst them on Saturday, that in anticipation of it, they appealed to Cæsar for assistance; and Cæsar, whom the Free Church doctors have so much reviled and abused, appeared at Canonmills in the shape of twenty policemen. Now, the calling of twenty policemen is a proper thing on proper occasions; but just think of twenty policemen to refute George Thompson! Twenty policeman to protect sophistry and lies against reason and christianity! Twenty policemen to secure the price of blood in the pockets of the priests! There's a Free Church for you.

I am afraid that you have either given yourself up to laziness, or else taken a craze in favour of the Free Church, as otherwise I cannot account for your neglecting to make use in treating of the late proceedings of her priests of the admirable illustrations which you have ready at hand in a volume of which I know that you are, in newspaper phrase, "a constant reader and admirer"—the *Provinciales* of Pascal. The iniquities and sophistries which you find charged by the writer of these exquisite letters against the Romish Jesuits, you might parallel in an instructive and interesting way by reference to the speeches and arguments of the Jesuits of the Free Church; and while you would have to admit that writers of different opinions—the pious Fenelon and the impious Voltaire—had joined in regarding the letters of Pascal as containing unjust and exaggerated charges against the Romish Jesuits, you could, from their own speeches, prove the accuracy and fidelity of your charges against the Free Church Jesuits, and say to them, "out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant."

Some historians have related, I know not upon what good authority, that the Dutch merchants who used to visit Japan were obliged, as the condition of their being allowed to trade with that Empire, to trample and spit upon the cross. This alleged behaviour of these godless merchants is certainly the nearest approach to the conduct of the Free Church priests, but it wants many of the features of their peculiar wickedness. If it was ever done, it was done by men who were more attentive to clothing their nether-ends with breeches than their faces with hypocrisy—who, in fact, had no religion, nor any pretence to it, about them, but were just plain, honest merchants, who believed in nothing but in the divinity of Mammon; whereas the crime of the Free Church priests is done by persons of the most obtrusive holiness—persons so offensively pure, so disgustingly sanctified, that a decent, humble christian, can hardly sit in their company.

THE FREEDOM OF THE CITY CONFERRED ON GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ.

The Town Council met (according to appointment) in the Council Chambers, at twelve o'clock to-day, for the purpose of conferring the freedom of the city on George Thompson, Esq. Long before the hour of meeting, the staircase and lobbies were crowded by ladies and gentlemen anxious to obtain admittance. Soon after the door was opened, the crowd rushed in, and the Council-room was immediately filled—the friends of the Council and Mr Thompson having been previously accommodated with seats. There were eighteen members of Council present, dressed in their gowns, with the insignia of office before them. The Lord Provost was in the chair, surrounded by Bailies Gray, Duncan, Mack, and Ritchie, and fourteen councillors, principally those who voted for the freedom to be granted. Mr Thompson was introduced by Bailie Duncan and Councillor Stott, amidst great applause. Mr Thompson was seated opposite the Lord Provost, in the chair usually occupied by the Convener of Trades; soon after

The LORD PROVOST rose and said—In the name of the Magistrates and Town Council of Edinburgh, I have now the honour of presenting you with the freedom of our city. The citizens of Edinburgh have taken a deep interest in the objects to which you have devoted your uncommon talents, and which you have pursued with unabating zeal and untiring energy. (Cheers.) From the day that the voice of Wilberforce awakened the dormant feelings of humanity in favour of the unhappy slave, and since first the atrocity of the trade in human beings was denounced as a violation of the first and great commandment, till the day when the lamented Dr Thomson, in the name of outraged humanity, demanded the immediate emancipation of every slave in the British colonies—(great applause)—the inhabitants of Edinburgh took a warm interest in this holy cause, and I am persuaded that their zeal for procuring liberty to the captives remains unabated to the present day. While we express to you our gratitude for your abundant labours in the cause of negro emancipation, we cannot forget your valuable services in advancing the cause of commercial emancipation—a measure fraught with the most important benefits to all classes. (Applause.) At first, the doctrine of free trade, especially free trade in the articles of food, was looked upon by the multitude as the mere dream of the theorist; but by the reiterated discussion of the subject, and the exposure of all the fallacies of the Protectionists, in which you co-operated with Cobden, Villiers, Bright, and their fellows, the barriers of error one after another were broken down, and the triumph of free trade, like the triumph of colonial slave emancipation, was achieved after a keen and protracted struggle. (Cheers.) In you, Sir, we recognise the eloquent and powerful advocate of liberty to the slave and freedom to trade. (Applause.) When Curran, by his brilliant rhetorical powers, defended his countrymen from the arm of oppression; when Erskine, by his surpassing eloquence and legal skill, vindicated the rights of Englishmen, they pled before juries of twelve—they were engaged and remunerated by their clients—the decision was the verdict of the jury. The jury before which you plead is the British public; and the decision—a righteous decision—will ultimately be given by your country and the world in favour of your cause. (Applause.)

It would ill become the chief magistrate, as representing the community, rashly to drag his fellow-councillors into sectarian disputes, or to disturb their harmony by giving utterance to sentiments which might excite angry or bitter feelings in the minds of his fellow-citizens, especially on theological subjects. Whatever, therefore, may be my own sentiments or the sentiments of my colleagues on subjects of this nature, the Magistrates and Council, avoiding such debateable questions, have been induced to offer you this mark of their respect and admiration, as the undaunted champion of the emancipation of the slave from the bonds of his cruel taskmasters, as well as the eloquent advocate of the emancipation of trade and commerce from the fetters which have too long cramped and confined the national energies—(great applause)—and in the hope that this mark of esteem from the citizens of the Scottish capital will encourage you in your holy warfare against that most debasing and soul-destroying system of man-stealing, slave-breeding, and slave-holding, till the last link of the last fetter from the last slave shall be broken off, and no man shall dare to claim a right of property in his brother man. (His lordship concluded amidst great applause. The Lord Provost, then, amidst loud and continued cheering, presented to Mr Thompson a handsome case in which was enclosed the document containing the freedom of the city.)

Mr THOMPSON, after having received it, with considerable emotion addressed the Council as follows:—

My Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Councillors of the city of Edinburgh,—I justly appreciate the honour you have this day conferred upon me. You have in times past bestowed this high distinction upon naval and military heroes who have fought the battles of their country; upon distinguished statesmen and patriots; and upon men eminent for their scientific and literary attainments. These have all been conspicuous for their deeds previous to the reception of this honour at your hands. To day you have selected an individual of humble station and equally humble talents, and have chosen to mark your approbation of certain great principles by making him the recipient of this mark of your favour. (Applause.) Those principles are, that men everywhere are entitled to their personal freedom, and that they are also entitled to realise the full reward of their industry, their ingenuity, and their honourable enterprise. (Cheers.) My public labours have ever been devoted to the advocacy of these principles, and taking it for granted that they are dear to you, I cannot but congratulate you upon the triumph which they have achieved in the emancipation of the bondmen of our colonies, and the removal of the restrictions upon the trade and commerce of our country. (Applause.) In labouring, in co-operation with others of far higher gifts and influence than I can lay claim to, I have been animated, I trust, by a sincere desire to advance the honour and prosperity of my native country, and the welfare and happiness of mankind at large. (Applause.) It is true, that in prosecuting these high enterprises, I have been engaged in struggles which have placed me for a time in painful conflict with certain classes of my fellow subjects; but it is also cheering to know, that in the progress of my labours, those who were once opponents have become friends; and even where they could not subscribe to every view taken of a particular question, have done justice to the motives of those by whom it was advocated. So I trust it will be, hereafter, if I should find myself for a time, in the discharge of my duty, in opposition to those whose private character and public virtue I would be the

first to acknowledge. (Great applause.) My Lord, I beg to assure your Lordship, and those by whom you are surrounded, that next to the success of the objects to which my life has been devoted, I congratulate myself upon having obtained this mark of your esteem. I trust its effects will operate widely upon those who are labouring for similar ends. I trust it will prove to such that their labours are not unnoticed, nor unappreciated, though in prosecuting them they do not acquire the laurels which grace the brow of the victor in the field. Let us be encouraged by what has taken place to-day; and if their object be honourable fame, learn from what has been done here, that while pursuing, by peaceful means, the happiness and freedom of their race, they will ultimately obtain the approbation, not only of their own consciences, but of the wise, the exalted, and the virtuous of their fellow-countrymen. (Cheers.) My Lord, I would take this opportunity of expressing my deep gratitude to the citizens of Edinburgh for the kindness and partiality they have for fourteen years invariably exhibited towards me. That kindness has long linked me by the strongest ties to this city. I shall now feel another and endearing tie—the tie of fellow-citizenship; the recollection that the chief magistrate and corporation of this ancient and royal burgh did me the honour to incorporate my name among the burgesses of Edinburgh. (Applause.) Should I ever lack a motive for perseverance and fidelity, I shall look back upon this day and take courage. And should I ever be tempted to unfaithfulness, the remembrance of this day will reprove me, and enable me to triumph over the suggestions of expediency. You have honoured me for sincerity and fidelity, and it shall be the aim of my life to prove that you did not select an unworthy object on which to bestow this high honour. (Great applause.) In conclusion, allow me to express my earnest desire that Providence may bless your Lordship and your colleagues in the Council of this city with long life, domestic happiness, and widely extended public usefulness, and bestow upon this city, and every part of our empire, the blessings of peace with all the nations of the world, and internal concord and growing prosperity.

Mr Thompson sat down amidst loud and continued cheering. Soon after, he rose and shook hands with the Lord Provost and the other members of the Council, and then almost immediately after left the Council-room, accompanied by John Wigham, Esq., Professor Pillans, Mr Douglass, Mr Buffum, and other friends. The Council afterwards adjourned.

THE SLAVES' COMPLAINT TO THE FREE CHURCH.*

When you came to the home of the slave,
  Why leave all our sorrows untold?
With the gospel of love on your tongue—
  Why clutch at the manstealers' gold?

You saw the poor bondman in chains;
  But you said not, Oh, loosen his bands,
For how could you plead for the slave,
  With the price of his blood in your hands!

Edinburgh Witness.

THE NEW CITIZEN.

Great indignation has been excited among the respectable classes of the community, by the discreditable conduct of the Town Council in conferring the hitherto coveted honour of the freedom of our city on the hireling agitator who has, for some weeks past, been busied in slandering the Free Church, and calumniating the ablest and best of Scotland's ministers. To have conferred such an honour on such a man *at any time* would have been a fearful and irremediable blunder, —a gross insult to the many distinguished individuals who have already received it at our hands, and a preventive to its being either desired, or even welcomed, by any future statesman, or philosopher, or philanthropist, on whom it would be a credit to confer it. As was remarked by one of the members of Council, the man is, and has always been, a mere "hired declaimer,"—ready, like a driver on a cab-stand, to take in any one who will pay him,—now the Rajah of Sattara, now the American Abolitionists, now a body of Indian Zemindars, now the Anti-corn Law League, and now Scotch Residuaries, Voluntaries, and Quakers,—willing, if he is standing without an employer, or the immediate prospect of one, even to take half-fare, or a little more, from the Teetotallers. But the circumstances in which the *honour* (!) is conferred make the conduct of the majority worse than a blunder: it is a crime. For, however the statement may be denied, it has, as every one knows, been conferred for the mere miserable purpose of getting a blow at, and offering an insult to, the Free Church of Scotland. Of course, we have no objection to Residuary and Dissenting Councillors abusing the Free Church, if they think it their duty to do so, or feel so inclined. They are quite welcome to give as many proofs as they deem expedient of the jealousy and hatred with which some of them,—although they have long tried to conceal it,—regard that Church. As we said lately, she has been too prosperous to be without enemies,—it would not be well for her if she were without them,—and let her be thankful that she has had strength given her sufficient to withstand them all, and many more, had they appeared. But while we do not object to their manifesting even the bitterness of their hostility,—while, on the contrary, we would rejoice did all such disguised enemies throw off the mask under which they feign friendship, and avow

themselves,—it is really disgraceful and deplorable to find them availing themselves of such means of attack as in this instance they have been so unscrupulous as to resort to,—actually, rather than want their "hit," and in order to cover it, degrading and destroying the character of our citizenship. We are aware that some of those who supported the motion expressed regret that it should have been brought forward at such an unfortunate time; but for this small piece of amiability we are not inclined to give them credit.

If anything were required to illustrate the real *animus* and character of the transaction, it would be a circumstance which we will take the liberty of mentioning. When the illustrious D'Aubigne was here last year, it was proposed to confer on him this same honour,—the freedom of the city; and sure we are that had the proposal been carried through, almost every citizen would have felt that thereby Edinburgh was more honoured than D'Aubigne? It was *not* carried through, however; and why? Because, as we are informed, *the Lord Provost objected to it*,—one of his grounds of objection being, that D'Aubigne, during his visit, had been so much mixed up with the Free Church, that the conferring on him of such an honour at such a time, *might give offence to the members of the Establishment*. Pity that such delicate scrupulosity should be so strangely partial and so unaccountably short-lived! Pity that when a man whom the world knows and reveres visits our city, he should be deprived of all civic honour because he has not attended the General Assembly of the Established Church; but that when another man comes,—one whom it were almost profanity to name in the same breath with the former,—and spends all his time in vilifying another Church, and in hounding on the rabble against her most distinguished ministers, he should be received with open arms, and treated as the man whom our dignitaries delight to honour! Such conduct requires no comment; it is sufficiently transparent. We are glad, for the sake of our city, that the thing was done by a *minority* of the Town Council, and has been all but universally reprobated by the public.

In our last we gave an extract from the letter of a London correspondent, detailing some of the characteristic statements made at a public meeting there by this young fellow-citizen of ours. We have since then received a copy of the *Universe* (a respectable religious paper recently commenced in London), which contains an abstract of the speech in which the statements referred to occurred. And for the information of our readers, and in order to give them some further insight (if they require it) into the character of the man, we quote the following passage:—

"The people of the Free Church are with you. I have received during the last month multitudes of letters addressed to me by members of the Free Church of Scotland, stating that they are ready to make up the money over and over again. They are remonstrating with their ministers,

and they are leaving their churches. (Cheers.) I was told that last Sunday week 250 members of the congregation of Dr Candlish (perhaps the most popular man after Dr Chalmers) vacated their seats in the Free Church, and left their empty pews, to bear testimony against the conduct of the deputation. (Cheers.) The majority of the ministers of that Church are with us; and I do believe that if Dr Chalmers were to rise in the Assembly of the Free Church and propose the sending back the money, with tears of joy in the court below, and in the gallery above, they would unanimously bless him for his act, and rejoice that the Church was restored to the character she enjoyed ere that money was brought to their treasury. (Hear, hear.) But still I have seen no indication of any disposition on the part of these leading ministers to give way. They have argued upon the question, written upon it most subtly; and Dr Candlish, in a deliverance he prepared for the Assembly, endeavoured to argue that there is a distinction between the system and the men, and while he has denounced the system, he has preserved the men; I do not see how, without a frank acknowledgment of error, they can undo what they have done. (Hear, hear.) But they must restore the money, or witness a rent in the Church. (Cheers.) People come to us literally weeping over the error that had been committed by the deputation."

Our readers will not be surprised at these statements, outrageously false as they know them all to be. They are not, by a long way, the first, nor will they be the last, of the same kind from the same quarter. It is, however, both ludicrous and painful to find the "citizen" saluted by the simple Londoners, at the enunciation of each falsehood, with "cheers," "hear, hear," "loud cheers," &c. &c., and to find also Dr Campbell of the *Christian Witness* rise and deliver one of his "boil and bubble" harangues, telling the folks that "George Thompson was *mighty in Scotland*,"—that "a glorious struggle was commencing there,"—that the Free Church would be compelled to "send back the money," and so forth. They appear to swallow all that the man has been telling them, and to imagine that a second Disruption is as near at hand as the full moon. Will they allow us to tell them how sadly they have been imposed upon? Will Dr Campbell allow us to tell him that he also has been imposed on? As to the ministers, the *unanimous* decision of the General Assembly sufficiently indicates *their* views. And every one here knows, that so far from the Free Church *people* being *with* these agitators, they hold them in detestation and scorn. Dr Cunningham, the special object of their attacks, cannot appear in public without being received with five minutes' enthusiastic cheering. The vast audience which attended on the General Assembly on Saturday week, when the question was discussed, were unanimous and eager in expressing their approbation. And so far from large numbers leaving the Free Church, these men have been here agitating for about six weeks, and, although we mingle as freely in public as most people, we have not heard of two individuals who have done so. The statement about Dr Candlish's congregation is utterly untrue; and so also are the statements which are being industriously circulated regarding other congregations. It is an evident part of the policy of these men to try and get some weak Free Church members to believe that others are leaving the communion,—calculating on the principle, perhaps, that fifty silly sheep will follow one,—but they will be disappointed. They may, in the course of their agitation, detach, as Mr Guthrie expressed it, one "loose tile" here and another there; but they will find that the Free Church, as a body, is too compact and powerful to be broken down, or even shaken, by an agitation so heartless and hypocritical as theirs.

TOWN COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS.

TUESDAY, June 16.

BAILIE GRAY occupied the chair, in the absence of the Lord Provost, who is at present in London on business connected with the city.

FREEDOM OF THE CITY TO MR GEORGE THOMPSON.

The minutes of the former sederunt having been read, and the Chairman having asked if the minutes were approved of,

Mr M. LOTHIAN said—As you have just put the question that the minutes now read be approved of, I rise to say that in one respect I cannot approve of them. I am dissatisfied with that part of them where you have conferred the freedom of the city upon Mr George Thompson. And as I have observed by your minutes that that motion rested on the ground of his services in the cause of freedom, I think it right to premise that I have no sympathy with the system of slavery in any form. If I had Mr Thompson's eloquence, I am quite certain that I, at least with equal honesty, would do all in my power to put an end to that system, as being one worthy of all execration—as one which infers an enormous amount of guilt both against God and against man; and if there lives a human being who can contribute in the smallest degree to put an end to that system, and who yet does not use his best exertions to do so, I believe he will have to answer to God for it. ("Hear, hear," from Mr Stott.) I am stating no new opinion. I remember, in the days of my boyhood, that my heart used to swell with indignation as I thought on slavery's sad abode; and I feel and wish as intensely, as ardently as ever I felt, that the day were come when the slave will no longer hear the oppressor's voice, nor dread the tyrant's rod. Now, it is the very strength and the very intensity of these feelings which compel me, at this moment, to say that at this time at least Mr Thompson has not deserved the honour which has been done to him on the ground on which it has been put. I say so, because it is my firm, my most deliberate, and my most honest conviction, that few men have done so much to retard the emancipation of the slave as I think Mr Thompson has done. Now, Sir, in support of that statement, I beg to remind you that that was the precise ground of the quarrel that Dr Channing in America had with his party.

Mr STOTT—I beg Mr Lothian's pardon for interrupting him, but I wish to know whether the Council reckons Mr Lothian in order. The freedom has been voted and granted, and the question now is about to be discussed on its merits. I think I have stopped Mr Lothian at the proper time, as he is now proceeding to state the merits of the case, and the grounds on which the freedom was granted. In point of order, I think Mr Lothian is perfectly incompetent to give an opinion upon the merits, inasmuch as he was absent, and the grounds upon which the freedom was granted have been conceded by Mr Lothian in the preamble of his speech. I put it to the Chairman whether it is in order to open up a matter which has been disposed of and perfectly completed.

Mr LOTHIAN—That I am in order is, I think proved by the fact that you (addressing the Chairman) put the question whether the minutes were approved of. Now, it may be that I am in a minority of one, although I do not expect it—but admitting that I am in a minority of one in maintaining, in an-

swer to your question, that the minutes be not approved of, that does not preclude me from my privilege of stating my reasons why I think they should not be approved of; and as to the difficulty of disposing of the question, seeing that the freedom has been conferred, I intend to meet that in the course of my observations. I have only further to say, that I think the objection would come with more force and delicacy from any other member of the Council than from the local chairman of Mr Thompson. I think he might have allowed the objection to be taken by some other member. I claim my privilege. I was not here when the motion for conferring the freedom was made; but as you put the question whether those minutes should be approved of, I was proceeding to give my reasons why they should not be approved of, and I do not know why I should be stopped because they were disagreeable to Mr Stott.

Mr Stott—They were not disagreeable to me.

Mr Tullis said that this was not the time for Mr Lothian to come forward. He ought to have come forward when the freedom was to be conferred.

Mr Lothian said—I was not aware that such a motion was to be proposed as that of conferring the freedom of the city on Mr Thompson; and it would have been indelicate for me to have interfered on the occasion when it was to be conferred. I have taken the very first opportunity, according to the standing orders of the Council, of expressing my dissent. It may be a futile dissent, but still I claim my liberty to dissent. Gentlemen should recollect that if they deprive me of my privilege, it may tell against themselves on another occasion.

Mr Tullis asked Mr Lothian if he did not get a letter inviting him to attend when the freedom was to be conferred; and said that he thought he ought to have come forward then with his reasons for objecting to it.

Mr Lothian—Would it have been gentlemanly for me to have come forward and interfered then, after Mr Thompson was invited to attend to receive the freedom?

Bailie Ritchie—My impression is that Mr Lothian is in order.

Mr Russell—My opinion is the same. I cannot see any other opportunity that he has had for stating his reasons. Mr Tullis has said that Mr Lothian should have come forward on the day when the freedom was to be conferred. Now, I cannot agree with that, and I hope that no other member of Council will be found to agree with it.

Mr Stott—Since Bailie Ritchie and Mr Russell think Mr Lothian is in order, I beg to withdraw my question.

Mr Lothian then proceeded—I was just stating that Dr Channing, whose leanings were altogether on the side of the slave, spoke of Mr Thompson's party in the following words:—Dr Channing says—"The abolitionists have spoken in an intolerant tone, equally unjust and unwise, which I will not defend;" and to this he adds—"Nothing will induce me to become responsible for their movements." Now, I would just ask you, what has Mr Thompson done since Dr Channing wrote these words? He came to Britain, the land of liberty, where the moment the slave sets his foot on its shore, as has been eloquently observed, every manacle falls from his limbs;—Mr Thompson came to Scotland, and he found Scotland undivided in opinion upon the evil and sin of slavery—he found the Free Church remonstrating with the slave-holding Churches; and

surely there is a vast deal to do between remonstrating and excommunicating. The Free Church found slavery in a different position from that of earlier days, when a master could liberate his slave if he pleased. They found that the refinements of modern times had in some places rendered this unlawful and impossible ; and they commenced remonstrating —a precedent which was set by the Secession—before they would cut the connection. Mr Thompson, however, forgetting the law of Christ, which says that you must deal before you excommunicate ; and forgetting also that the Free Church which had already maintained the law of Christ in other particulars, in defiance of the very highest party in the land, backed by the civil power, was not likely to quail before popular clamour—I say forgetting all that, he has managed matters so as to give some colour to make the South American planter imagine that Scotland is divided on the lawfulness or sin of slave-holding. Why, I can suppose that in consequence of his proceedings, the people of America will say that a relaxation of public opinion upon this question has begun in Scotland—that a re-action is begun in Scotland in their favour. According to his representations a Church embracing one-third of the whole population of Scotland, influential by the character of her ministers—influential by the purity of her doctrines — influential by the magnanimous adherence to principle, and by the largeness of the sacrifices she has made—influential by the large number of her adherents ; and, I will add, too, what is better than all, influential, I think, by the many visible tokens of the presence of that Divine Being whose providence has appeared like the pillar of fire before her, in her darkest night—I say that this man has so represented matters as to give to this Church, with all her influence, and this country, in which no man can be kept as a slave, the appearance—he has done it most falsely and most unjustifiably—of actually being in favour of slavery. Now, as a member of this Church I can forgive his slanders. I have learned that a pure Church may very often be a much abused Church ; but I say, in the name of outraged humanity—in the name of the slave ruthlessly torn from his family and from his country, and deprived of his liberty—what right had Mr Thompson to represent this country as divided on the question of the sin of slaveholding ? I have heard many arguments in favour of slavery in the course of my life. The very best argument that I ever heard I have regarded as wretched, and trampled it under my feet ; but I must say that the very best argument for slavery that ever I heard could just be this, if it were true, that a country like Scotland and a Church so pure as the Free Church could possibly countenance it for a moment. I say that the man who has continued to represent matters in this light has betrayed his duty to the slave, and has misrepresented his country ; and I must say that granting the freedom of the city to him at this time was undoubtedly a most discreditable blunder. Having shown that Mr Thompson's conduct was not such as to help the cause of the slave, I will now come to the second reason which I have for resisting the approval of the minutes ; and it is this, that it has always been held as a good reason for this Council withholding the freedom of the city, that the man on whom this honour is proposed to be conferred is at the time engaged in fomenting religious strife in the community. Now, I charge Mr Thompson with that. I charge him with having enlisted in a crusade

against the Free Church; and I can prove it; but the fact is, I do not require to prove it, as so completely has the question of slavery been lost in the discussion of the Free Church, that the newspapers have dropped designating the meetings as meetings against slavery; and accordingly I find in the *Caledonian Mercury* of yesterday a report of a meeting in Glasgow, headed with these words—"The agitation against the Free Church." I say the newspapers are well warranted in so heading these reports; because I observe, from reading Mr Thompson's speeches, that the attacks on that religious body seem to have been the main object of his exertions. And is it not most wretched and most miserable that a man intrusted with a cause so high and so holy as the freedom of the slave, should have descended to questions so much out of his way, and calculated to be so injurious? but is it not tenfold more bitter to hear him boasting of his success in damaging the Free Church—a statement, by the by, which he retracted on the succeeding night, because it was not true. It is not against the churches of this country generally that I find him so acting, but it is against the Free Church in particular; for I find him sparing other churches, who, if there be fault in the Free Church in their past connection with the South American Churches—which I deny—have acted substantially in the same way in which the Free Church did. And I say farther, that I find him sparing the old Establishment, although, at this very moment, that Church holds the patronage of a church in the slave states—in which there is a railing put across to divide the congregation into two classes, the slave-holders and the white population from the slaves; and in this way they are compelled to worship that God who distinguishes men, certainly into two classes, but not into such classes as these—as with him there is neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free—but into classes embracing simply those who have done good and those who have done evil. Now, I would be a most unworthy member of the Free Church if I did not take this opportunity of stating that I never in my life saw a public man endeavour to practice on the public mind with grosser misrepresentations or more unfair statements against the Free Church than this man has uttered in the course of his crusade against the Free Church. Why, I have seen him exhibit every feature between the most reckless asserter and the lowest quibbler. At one time recklessly telling us that the Free Church sympathises with slave-holding; and at another time asserting that the Free Church party maintained that the Apostle admitted Philemon to the Lord's table because he was a slave-holder, while what had been stated was that Philemon had been admitted although he was a slave-holder. No man will deny that Mr Thompson raised religious strife in Edinburgh. I would sooner expect to be told that the sun was not shining at the present moment than to hear that denied. The fact is undeniable. Then, if you admit me that fact, I will tell you a story. I have a precedent for saying that a man who was engaged in sowing religious strife ought not to have the freedom of the city conferred on him. I hold a letter in my hand, dated May, 1845, which relates to Dr Merle D'Aubigne. I will not, for one moment, compare Dr Merle D'Aubigne with Mr Thompson. D'Aubigne's labours will be heard of not only during the existence of the English and German lan-

guages ; but his works will be translated with these languages to the end of time. Well, then, what have I to say in regard to this distinguished man ? I have to say that a friend of his addressed a member of the Town Council a year ago, suggesting that he ought to have the freedom of the city conferred on him. I hold in my hand the answer which this gentleman received. He says—"I have had a long conversation with a friend of undoubted influence."

Mr Stott—Name.

Mr Lothian—If any other gentleman than Mr Stott desires me to name the individual alluded to, I will do it.

Several members having made a similar request,

Mr Lothian stated that it was the Lord Provost who was referred to in the letter. He then read the letter in full, which went on to say that his lordship "could not support the proposal which I made for presenting the freedom of the city to our distinguished friend. He feared it would raise the question of partiality for the Free Church, and would be sure to give great offence to the Established party." Now, I say that that sentiment reflects the highest honour on my relative, the Lord Provost. I respect him for having written that letter, although I think he was mistaken in supposing that such remarks could apply to Dr D'Aubigne. But, independently of that, if his lordship thought that he did right in saying that it should not be given, for fear of raising the question of partiality to the Free Church, and giving offence to the Established Church, I say was there no member of Council, with such a precedent before him, ready to say, altering the language of the Provost's answer a little—Do not give Mr Thompson the freedom of the city at this moment, for fear of raising the question of partiality to the enemies of the Free Church, and giving great offence to that body ? I leave that question to be answered by the members of Council. I think it is well, however, that the public should know it. I will just close on this point by another reference, which shows that if ever a crusade on earth was commenced to detract from the character of a religious body, it was the present. It was begun by Mr Thompson with this object; and while he was in the position of having the honour of the city conferred on him, I find him making the following statement—I quote from a report of one of his meetings in the *Scotsman* of 6th June —"That it was the intention of Mr Buffum to proceed immediately to America, and that he proposed collecting all the information that could be acquired regarding the ministers with whom the Free Church deputation had associated when in America, so that he would have his quiver full against the meeting of the General Assembly of the Free Church in May 1847." Now, I suppose I am in the company of gentlemen; and being so, I will not give vent to the indignation which I felt when I read this passage; but I say if ever spy was sent on an errand—and sent, too, by a man known to be a professional and paid orator—I say if ever a man was sent on an errand which threatens more thoroughly to open up even the decencies and privacies of social life, this is an errand of that kind;—and I will take the liberty of telling Mr Thompson that the statements of a man so employed will not go forth to the public without being polluted and corrupted by his very breath, unless he has the courage to take up his position on the very

spot, and there to bring forth his charges before a competent board, and lead proof regarding them. I altogether mistake the Scottish character if Mr Buffum's coming slinking back to this country with statements secretly bottled up in America will weigh the weight of a feather in their estimation. So much for the disproval of the minutes on their merits. I have farther to say, however, that not only should Mr Thompson not have got the freedom at all, but that he has got it in a wrong way. He got it in a way in which it ought not to have come to him. The value of such a compliment depends upon giving it deliberately, with full notice of the intention to do so. It is of no value if it is given dexterously—if it is given by a majority—if it is got up by surprise. Were it to be given in this way, the compliment would be destroyed. Now, I beg to say that the proposition to confer it was not in the programme of this day fortnight. It was not known to many of the most respectable members of the Council, until our friend (Mr Stott) went round the table and told them of the proposal after they had entered the room. I happened to be in the Lord Provost's shop twenty minutes before the hour ; and I said to him, Is there any business of any importance to be brought forward, for I have some other duties to attend to, as members have occasionally at times? His lordship desired me to come into his back shop, and I would see the programme. On looking over the programme his lordship's own words were, " Oh, there is nothing of consequence to-day," and in his jocular way he added, " You may go and mind your business to-day." This I did, and it was not until the next morning, on reading the newspapers, that I was aware of the proposal that was brought forward to confer the freedom of the city upon Mr Thompson, to my great astonishment. In the very preceding meeting of Council I was told that I was irregular in doing something which was not in the programme. You will remember that I made a few observations as to whether a remedy might not be found for the case of the unfortunate collision which was existing between the Magistrates and the Quarter Session of Justices as to the withholding of ale licenses. I was told that I was irregular, as it was not in the programme, although I merely wished that the matter should be referred to a committee. Notwithstanding what took place on that occasion, I find that at the meeting immediately following a matter affecting the character of the Council, affecting the value of those presentations to men of talent and influence, many of whose names I rejoice to say are upon our burgess roll—I say that a matter of that importance was actually carried without notice. Now, I will say that it was not only carried in a wrong way in that respect, but I think it was very shabbily carried in the way that it was gone about in the Council. I do not think it came very graciously from the local chairman of Mr Thompson ; it might have come from some other person. If the compliment was deserved, gentlemen differing from Mr Thompson would have done it more gracefully. I have voted for the presentation to individuals who differed from me in general politics or upon other grounds, whom I thought worthy of having the freedom conferred. I do not know whether our friend felt obliged to Mr Thompson for picking him out from the *elite* of Edinburgh, and making him his local chairman, and whether he felt bound to return the compliment, having got one himself, but I do say that it did not come gracefully from him, more especially without notice. So far

from the compliment having been given by a majority of the Council, it was given by only 16, five dissented from it, three did not vote, and nine were absent; and yet they call that honour! I think when Mr Thompson hears of all this, that he should change his note, and in place of "send back the money," should substitute "send back the presentation" (laughter); for I am sure there never was a presentation presented so shabbily before. In addition to what I have stated I must add, that I do not know if he belongs to the class upon whom this honour ought to be conferred, because, as I understand, he is a professional and paid speaker. I do not know that the circumstance of a man being hired to conduct a public discussion marked him out for any particular reward, albeit the discussion in which he is employed is one which ought to receive the support of the public. Having made these remarks, I am not going to move that the resolution should be recalled. The deed is done; and therefore I cannot move the recalling of it. I do not think it has been well done, but it is my opinion that it fairly gives rise to the question—and that is the practical object I am coming to—whether regulations should not be adopted by the Council for the purpose of preventing surprises of the same kind occurring again. I think that is most reasonable; and I would have pressed that view, supposing thirty-two members had been present, because it might happen that the one who was absent might have reasons which, if he had an opportunity of stating, might dissuade the Council from carrying their resolution. Before the character of the Council was committed, it was of the utmost importance that each should have an opportunity of delivering his sentiments on the subject, and he could either come or stay away as he pleased. I did not wish to introduce the Free Church. But since it was introduced in connection with the matter before us, I think I at least may be permitted to say, that it is no new thing for Christian bodies and Christian men to be reviled in this world. I do not expect that she will ever reply to the slanderer, as I do not think she would be honoured by his praise. I feel confident that the rod of the wicked will not long rest upon the righteous; and I shall conclude by quoting the very eloquent language of my friend Mr Guthrie. When he returned from his manse collection, and laid upon the table of the Assembly the princely sum of L.116,000, he said, having visited the length and breadth of the land, he was more and more satisfied of the strength and power of the Free Church; he had marked her bulwarks, he had seen her towers, he had seen how her citizens abounded, and the result of his mission proved how the land had yielded her increase. Now, having been permitted by the kindness of the Council to avail myself of my undoubted privilege of dissenting from the resolution—for which I respectfully return you my best thanks—I will just say whether or no you maintain your opinion that the honour has been rightly conferred, you will not differ from me in this, that such a thing should never have been done surreptitiously or by stealth; and that if one, much more half a dozen, or a larger number, dissent from it, it calls for some regulation being adopted whereby surprise will be prevented in time to come. If the Council sympathises with this, I am satisfied. I believe that even the gentlemen who carried the motion will see that there is something wrong when parties are absent or taken by surprise. I will only add that all the remarks I have made would have applied with equal force if Mr Thompson had begun his cru-

sade against the Independents, or the Seceders, or against any other Christian body ; and therefore, on broad general grounds, irrespective of the Free Church, or any church whatever, I pray the Council to consider whether I am asking anything unreasonable in asking this, that before parties are permitted, by any course of this kind, to commit the Council, all should have an opportunity of being heard upon it.

Mr Stott said—I do not know that it is necessary that I should reply to this rigmarole statement of Mr Lothian. In fact I never heard a speech which went so much round and round the mark, and yet never touched on one single point or argument on which I founded my motion for conferring the freedom of the city on Mr Thompson. While I am certain that the cause of the slave will not suffer by Mr Lothian's remarks, and while I am at the same time convinced, from the notes I have taken, that it would be an easy matter to answer Mr Lothian from Mr Lothian, yet I think I will best consult the dignity of the Council to allow his remarks to go for what they are worth.

Treasurer Thomson said—I fully concur in all that has been stated by Mr Lothian ; and will only give you my reasons of dissent from the motion adopted at last meeting. I have also to state that I do not conclude with a motion, solely because I understand an intimation from the Lord Provost will be read, shortly indicating the course to be pursued on future occasions. The following are Mr Thomson's reasons of dissent :—1st, Because the Council was taken by surprise. 2d. Because the freedom was voted by a minority of the whole Council, while several, even of the supporters of the motion, characterised it as ill-timed. 3d, Because Mr Thompson does not occupy the eminent position of those upon whom this honour has hitherto been conferred. 4th, Because the course Mr Thompson is now pursuing is most injurious to the cause of the emancipation of the slave.

Mr Lothian said, I am most delighted to hear that the Lord Provost has taken the matter up ; and in consequence of this being the case, I do not feel called upon to make any motion on the subject. I certainly do hope that the proposal of his lordship will have the effect of preventing the Council being taken by surprise on any future occasion.

The following resolutions as to the mode of conferring the freedom of the city were then read by the clerk, to be submitted to next meeting of Council by the Lord Provost :—

1. That any member of Council proposing to confer the freedom of the city on a distinguished individual, shall first advise with the Lord Provost's committee.

2. That notice of the intention shall be given to the clerk not later than twelve o'clock of the Saturday preceding any ordinary meeting of Council, and the clerk shall therefore summon the committee, and the councillor making the proposition, at some convenient hour on the following Monday. The notices for this meeting of committee shall specify its object.

3. That when the proposal originates with the Lord Provost, he shall follow the same course ; reserving to him, however, the power of summoning a special meeting of Council for this purpose, in which case the billets will, of course, state the object of the meeting.

4. That on all occasions of ordinary or extraordinary meetings, when a motion is made for conferring the freedom of the city, where a difference of opinion arises and a vote is demanded, it shall be requi-

site that two-thirds, or twenty-two members of Council, shall concur in the grant.

Mr Russell—I confess, on a review of the proceedings of the Town Council regarding the conferring of the freedom of the city on Mr Thompson, that I have cause to regret the course I took on that occasion. I feel now that the time was ill chosen; not that Mr Thompson in other circumstances would have been unworthy of the honour, but that in consequence of the peculiar time chosen for conferring that honour, it would have been proper for me, instead of voting for conferring the freedom in these circumstances, to have abstained from voting at all. I do not sympathise with much of the proceedings adopted by Thompson and his coadjutors with reference to the Free Church. The language employed by him in describing a body of men whom I am accustomed to consider as embracing a great amount of the piety and philanthropy of the land, was unworthy both of his former reputation and of the cause in which he was engaged. When I look at the conduct of Dr Cunningham, at his calm dignified conduct in the meeting of the General Assembly of the Free Church, and contrast it with that of Mr Thompson ——

Mr Clark, Mr Lindsay, and Mr Robertson, interrupted Mr Russell, and said that this was really too bad.

After some remarks from some other members, Mr Russell was allowed to proceed. He said—When interrupted I was contrasting the calm and dignified conduct of Dr Cunningham with the sort of clap-trap proceedings of the other party in connection with the promotion of their object. I submit whether or not the arguments employed by Dr Cunningham in the Free Church Assembly have ever been fairly met out of doors by Thompson or his coadjutors. I do not subscribe wholly to the arguments of Dr Cunningham; but I do say that these arguments were deserving of the attention of Mr Thompson and his friends, and that they ought to have given attention to them, instead of indulging in language so abusive, so vituperative as they have used against the Free Church. I say it advisedly that a great number of the parties who attended the meetings in the Music Hall went there not so much to hear the truth or from love to it, as because of their animus to the Free Church, and because of their desire to see the Free Church put down. (Disapprobation from several members.)

I sympathise with many

said it was impossible for the English farmer, however practised he might be in agriculture—however anxious he might be to cultivate his lands to the utmost extent—it was impossible for him to compete with the foreign farmer who was not burdened with such local and general taxation. (Hear, hear.) He believed that one of the most fatal measures connected with the system of free trade would be the throwing out of cultivation a large portion of our soil, and of a necessary dependence on foreign countries for supply. If their lordships had really determined that free trade should be the order of the day, they should remove the many burdens that pressed upon the agriculturist. The revenue, he also contended, would inevitably fall if the proposed bill were carried. (Cheers.) He looked upon this measure with the greatest alarm and distrust. He did not look upon it in a selfish point of view, but as affecting the whole of our population, both manufacturing and agricultural; and felt confident that those who had formed the Anti-Corn-law League, and carried on an active warfare against the agricultural interest, would be amongst the first to suffer in the general destruction which they were bringing on all classes. (Hear, hear.) He lamented most deeply that his noble

FREE CHURCH—*SATURDAY.*

As it was expected that the subject of American slavery would be discussed, the hall was filled with a respectable audience, the anti-slavery deputation, comprising Messrs George Thompson, Buffum, and Douglass, being also present.

Mr GRAY moved, that the overture in regard to elders and deacons, and that relating to the admission of ministers from other churches, be adopted, and passed into laws of the church, which was agreed to; and that the overture on the election of office-bearers be remitted to a committee to prepare it for being passed into a declaratory law of the church, which was also agreed to.

REPORT AND OVERTURES ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The MODERATOR stated, that memorials on the subject of American slavery had been received from the Glasgow Emancipation Society, from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and from the Ladies' Society of Edinburgh.

Two overtures on the same subject were then read, one from the Synod of Sutherland and Caithness, praying the Assembly to intimate to the Presbyterian churches of America, that the Free Church of Scotland could not hold communion with them unless they shall make strong and vigorous efforts for the abolition of slavery in the United States; and the other overture was from the Synod of Angus and Mearns, praying that the Assembly should seek for the abolition of slavery in America, by pursuing the course upon which the church had already entered. There was also read a petition purporting to be from elders, deacons, and members of the Free Church in Dundee, calling upon the Assembly to testify against the sin of slaveholding in America, by disowning fellowship with those churches that lend it their sanction.

Dr CANDLISH rose amidst loud applause. He said, the committee of the Assembly would remember that it had been instructed at a previous diet to take into consideration the answer of the Presbyterian Church of the United Statesof America to a communication which was addressed to that church two years ago. That communication was an acknowledgment of their kindness and sympathy with them in their time of trial; and at the same time, along with that communication, they transmitted to the Presbyterian Church of America a report which was given in at a meeting of the Commission of Assembly, and approved of by them, relating to the alleged connection of the churches in America with the system of slavery prevailing there. The General Assembly of 1845 also approved of a report upon that subject, but he was not aware that that report had been transmitted to the Presbyterian Church of America. It was simply a report relative to the principles upon which they should conduct their intercourse with that church; but it was rather a report for their own guidance than to be communicated to other churches—it was to bring out the principles which appeared to this church should regulate their intercourse with churches situated like those of America. The committee have had the answer to the communication referred to under their consideration, and it consisted of a letter addressed to the Moderator of the Free Church of Scotland, to be by him communicated to the church at large. In that letter reference is made to a deliverance of the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America, of 20th May 1845, upon various points, and, accordingly, the committee have taken into consideration the deliverance itself, that deliverance now forming substantially a part of the communication which had been made to them. The committee, he was instructed to state, had seriously considered the subject,

but they had not yet been able to prepare a full and formal answer. They had instructed him to report, however, first, that having taken the letter remitted to them into their consideration, they have much pleasure in intimating, that the communication addressed by that church to the Presbyterian Church of America had been received and acknowledged with Christian affection, and that this church might continue to maintain the friendly intercourse which had been begun with good hope of mutual edification. As the report was not yet completed, he would call the attention of the Assembly to the precise position of the question as respected their relation to the Presbyterian Church of America, and crave leave to sketch the different heads which were to be taken up in the proposed answer. He confessed he was anxious on that occasion to have an opportunity of calling the attention of the house, and through the house, the church, to the actual state of the question, which had got involved in considerable embarrassment, not from any fault of theirs. Now, he said at the outset, that he would never consent as a minister of that church, as a Christian minister and a Christian man—he could never give his consent, and he trusted that the church never would give its consent, to the discussion of that question, either there or in the inferior courts, upon any other footing than that of a grave, religious, and scriptural question—the question as to the relation that ought to subsist between Christian churches. (Applause.) That question was one of such a character as to require that those who came to the consideration of it should have right views, and views upon which they were substantially agreed, as to what the church of Christ is, and what its duty is in reference to its intercourse with other churches. Those who came to the consideration of that question—one turning entirely upon the Word of God, and upon what it taught respecting the character of the church, the responsibility of the church, and the mutual relation of the branches of which it was composed—those who came to consider that question should be men who were of one mind and heart in reference to what the church of God was, what were its standards of duty, and what the principles by which the question was to be tested really were—the principles, he meant, of catholicity among the different branches, there and elsewhere, of the one visible church of the living God. The question for them to consider was, were they justified in keeping up and maintaining a friendly intercourse with the Presbyterian Church of America?—that question, and that alone would he consent to consider. Any other question that may have been raised involves considerations altogether, as it seemed to him, beyond the range of the legitimate discussion of that Assembly of that church. Now, he would not argue that question at length, because he did not see that it was open to any argument at all. If, having been brought into circumstances of friendly intercourse with the Presbyterian Church of America—let that church be ever so guilty in any particular matter that may be alleged against it, they were not yet at that stage when the question arose of their ceasing to have friendly intercourse with it; for the very last step that any church was entitled to take in the way of dealing with a sister church, with which, in the providence of God, it has been brought in connection—the last step it was entitled to think of is to renounce all friendly intercourse. She has numerous duties incumbent upon her if that church has sinned, and she may not even listen to the proposal of breaking off friendly intercourse, except that proposal was the very last resort, and after she he had discharged all her other duties to that church. (Loud applause.) No one who believed in the oneness of the body of Christ, no one who believed in the catholicity of the visible church of Christ, no one who understood what was the relation of one Christian to another,

and of one Christian community to another, could for a moment call in question, that if they were brought in the providence of God, it might even be inadvertently, or in a manner to which they looked back with regret (which was not the case with them), into a connection with a particular church, that they could cut that connection unless they were prepared to say that that church had ceased to be a church of the living God; and they had many other duties to discharge before they could dream of ceasing that intercourse. (Applause.) But he would at once say, that he saw no cause to regret their having been brought in the course of God's providence into friendly connection with the churches in America; he saw no cause to look back with sorrow and shame on the manner in which they were brought into that connection; he saw no cause to regret the continuance of that connection, and he believed that that connection did tend to their mutual edification. They had many things to learn from that church—there were many improvements which they might adopt from them, standing, as they did, in a position, in some respects, of high superiority to them; and, he believed, that in various particulars bearing on the right conduct of a church of Christ, they would do well as a church to receive their suggestions, to consider them, and carry them out. But they were told that they looked upon their connection with these churches as a misfortune, that they somehow or other regretted it, and that they felt they had got into a scrape. Even supposing this was the case—even though they found themselves involved in a connection with those churches, which they would now have shunned—they dared not, in the exercise of that communion which they should maintain with the whole body of Christ, cut the connection, even with such a church, sinning as she might be, till they had addressed to her remonstrance after remonstrance, pleading after pleading—till they had fully exhausted their views upon the subject. Before he could consent to break off friendly intercourse with these churches, he must be satisfied, first, that they had done their duty in regard to them—and, second, that these churches had obstinately refused to do theirs. The other day a sister church had come to the resolution of declining intercourse with the churches of America; but the very ground upon which that church is alleged to have adopted that resolution, is, that it had exhausted the means of remonstrance, and that they had all been neglected. He pronounced no opinion as to how far that church had performed her duty; but he would simply state the fact, that the man in that church who stands out in point of intellect, its leading man, Dr John Brown, has recorded his dissent from the resolution. No doubt that resolution was a discouraging thing to other churches striving to bring those of America to a sense of their duty, and it might be thought presumptuous in them to think that their remonstrance may have effect, but this should not deter them from their duty. But he must say, that he believed they were in favourable circumstances for now stating their views to those churches, perhaps more so than any other church. Not to speak of other considerations, they might in a sense say that they had in their behalf stood a very considerable amount of the same treatment to which they themselves have been subjected at home; they have borne reproach and odium because they would not join in the cry against them, when they thought the statements made to be undeserved; and this gave them an advantage, always assuming that they would make their communications in such a spirit of tenderness and faithfulness as ought to be addressed by one Christian church to another. He trusted they were in a position to maintain their testimony before the world, in declaring that these Christian churches were not such as they have been represented to be, but that they contained an amount of piety and godliness among their ministers, and such a number of converted men in their congregations, greater,

he believed, in proportion, than could be found almost in any other church of Christ. It were easy for this church to get a great deal of popularity and favour by at once and summarily to take up some high watchword, and utter some stern denunciations—it were easy to get rid of a difficult question by cutting the knot by some extravagant and extreme assertion of principle; but the church may not thus avoid her duty of calmly considering the question in all its aspects—it might be a refuge for them, but it was not needed as a refuge. (Cheers.) None of them who were familiar with the circumstances of the case would be disposed to think that the petition on the table was entitled to any weight whatever. There were some of their friends throughout the country who were not well informed of the particulars in the matter under consideration—they have taken up the notion that the church has got into an awkward predicament, and that she must be got out of it, no matter at what concession to popular clamour. He hoped now, however, that their friends will be satisfied that there was no occasion for such uneasy apprehensions. He trusted that that church was strong enough then to withstand the clamours of the mob. (Loud applause.) The remaining part of the subject—how were they to keep up their intercourse with those churches?—was the only real point for consideration. He presumed that it would be the mind of all of them that the communication being couched in terms of Christian affection, deserved an answer, and in consequence of its containing some views from which they were compelled to differ, that it demanded an answer. The present state of matters may have excited feelings of irritation, of annoyance, and indignation, and put them in a position of defence, of apology, and of explanation, which might easily be perverted, so as to bear the aspect of a defence of slavery; and on the other hand, a tendency might be to induce them to seek to avoid the appearance of evil, and to take some step in advance, hastily and immaturely, to get out of their difficulties. The reverend Doctor then referred to a controversy which was being carried on in New York by a Mr Phelp and Dr Bacon both ministers of evangelical churches, as to what should be the conduct of missionary churches in reference to the slave population, the former maintaining that slaveholding should be visited with the discipline of the church. He continued—Had Wilberforce in England and Thomson in Scotland suffered themselves to be driven into a false position—had they found their path crossed with such questions as those, what would have been the result? They might have been impeded in their course, or driven out of their way, but he could well imagine the terms in which they would have denounced the attempt to mar their efforts. He would now speak of the principles of the letter from the American churches. From that letter they seemed to have adopted, to a greater extent than they could approve, the principle of non-interference in civil affairs; but they did not maintain that, in all circumstances that doctrine should be held, as they had recently exerted themselves effectually, by exhorting their congregations, and other means, to avert the threatened calamity of a war with this country. He would ask them, then, to go a little further in reference to the matter of slavery, for in their letter they assured them "that they do regard as proper subjects of discipline all who treat their slaves as mere property and not as rational, accountable, and immortal beings, and they do condemn slavery, when for the sake of filthy lucre." He would also ask them whether they thought it right to obey or resist the law forbidding the teaching of the slave to read? and it did seem to him that it was impossible they could avoid the duty of seeking to obtain its repeal. So also in regard to marriage amongst the slaves; it seemed to him monstrous that a church should exist in the midst of a population, who were living in a state where marriage is only celebrated

for a time; subject to be broken at the pleasure of man, which had sacredly been bound by God himself. The reverend gentleman then contrasted the state of slavery in the old world, and that at present existing in America, and showed that while every facility was given for the emancipation of the slave in ancient times, in America, which boasted to be the freest country in the world, the greatest obstacles were interposed in the way of the private and public emancipation of slaves. It was impossible, he continued, for the churches there to remain inactive; and if they came over and told them that they had adopted a plan to procure the immediate repeal of those laws that hindered emancipation, he pledged himself, he pledged his church, and he pledged the whole people of Scotland, that thousands upon thousands would be poured into their treasury. (Great applause.) He begged leave to say, that if twenty millions be needed there for the emancipation of the slaves, as the legislature here conferred upon the West India proprietors, they would bear by voluntary effort their full share of the twenty millions. (Applause.) He held it then to be quite clear that slaveholding *prima facie* in the first blush of it is a sin, and never let them cease to testify to the world that slavery is a sin, and that it would sooner or later draw down upon the sinner the just judgments of God. If he found a man a slaveholder, then he (Dr Candlish) would throw upon him the burden to prove that he is not a sinner; it was upon this principle that they would ever maintain that a man may be so situated that he has no other alternative but to remain a slaveholder and protest against the evil and seek its removal. Cases have been put, that, in order to get out of it, they had to commit sin against God in emancipating their slaves. But the *onus probandi* is upon the slaveholder, and he must be asked before they could fellowship with him, to show that he has no other alternative but to continue in that state. But it was another principle of Christian duty that if a man, whatever his legal right to hold as property another man, if he treat that other man as a slave, he was guilty of a positive sin, and acted contrary to the mind and will of God. If a man showed him, to the satisfaction of his mind as a Christian minister, that he was in circumstances in which he must be a slaveholder, then he said to him, if you must be a slaveholder in the eye of the law, what are you in your own eyes? What do you think yourself to be? Do you regard yourself as a slaveholder? If you do, you sin against God, and make your brother a piece of goods and chattels, and the church that would not so regard him is neglecting its duty. In conclusion, he said, that throughout the whole of that discussion, there has nothing pressed more upon his mind than this—that while these questions are needlessly raised—while the church of the Living God is thus needlessly tormented—while men, on the one side, are making such demands, and putting forth such views as necessarily come into collision with principles regarding church fellowship, that they do not even profess to sympathise with—and while, on the other hand, the men who are assailed are compelled to assume too apologetic a tone in defending themselves—did it not grieve every Christian man that in the meantime the poor slave was perishing? And was it not enough to make some men pause and reflect that this at least was true, that never before has this battle been fought upon the same ground, and by the same weapons as were now resorted to. Was this fact not enough to make the friends of abolition pause and reconsider their position? If they could not help it—if it be an indispensible point of conscience on their part that cannot be got rid of—if they continue to raise this question, which they cannot but see involved principles in reference to Christian churches and Christian men, which, he ventured to say, they did not anticipate when they began to take up this ground—he would appeal to them, if his voice could reach across the Atlantic, and ask

if there could not be found men in that vast country who would come forward and say, we hold no principle that forces us to raise this question, we are content to fight the old battle upon the old ground– we seek no new weapons, we ask no new mode of warfare; and if that church would cast away from them the embarrassment with which the question had got involved—if some half dozen men in America, with the spirit of Wilberforce, of Clarkson and of Thomson, would be found rising far above this agitation saying, in plain English, we shall go back to the old times for the old argument—if such men could be found, it would be the greatest blessing to the slave; and if every man in the churches of America did not lend himself right heartily to such a movement, then he for one would consent to cut the connection with them. (The rev. Doctor resumed his seat amidst loud and continued applause.)

Mr MACBETH, Glasgow, rose to address the house in support of the petition from Dundee. The principle which he defended was, that the churches of this country ought not to have fellowship with those who are slaveholders or who defend slavery. He did not, however, object to friendly intercourse with the American churches, but he thought that that intercourse ought to be one of warning and remonstrance only, and that the Free Church should not allow ministers from those churches to stand in their pulpits, or admit a deputation from them into their General Assembly. (Applause.) He maintained that a man cannot hold property in man without committing a sin of the deepest dye, and that slaveholding is *per se* necessarily a great sin. Dr Candlish agreed with him as to the atrocious nature of slavery, but the great difference between Dr Candlish and him was, that he (Mr M.) held the slaveholder to be necessarily a sinner. He next proceeded to show that slaveholding was not recognised in the Scriptures. That the word which may be translated slave does not in every case necessarily bear that translation, but sometimes the opposite; for it is often applied to the servants of Christ, who are not slaves, but Christ's freemen. He then went on to show that the two great grants given by God to Adam and Noah gave man property in the beasts of the field, of the air, but they never conferred a property in man; and the Almighty not having given man such a property, he had no right to take it himself. In the *Shorter Catechism*, also, allusion is made to "God's property in us." For man, then, to hold property in his fellow-being was a direct usurpation of the right of God; and yet the Free Church refused to affirm that a man who held slaves, *per se*, commits a great sin. Mr Macbeth referred at considerable length to the three periods of time of Divine history, and defied any one to show that either in the Patriarchal age, the duration of the Theocracy, or in the Christian era, there could be found an illustration to warrant man having property in man. As to the case of Philemon, often referred to, he thought it could not be shewn, that after he became a Christian, he continued a slaveholder. Much was said about erastianism in this country, but the churches in the slaveholding States were under erastianism of the worst form, for they allowed the law of the place to interfere with the dearest rights of the people. (Applause.) In 1794 one of the Presbyterian Churches in America held that slaveholding was a sin, but since 1816, they had blotted out that principle from their statute book. Here, then, was the case of the church who had the light, deliberately turn its back upon it, and loving to walk in darkness. It was known also that in some of the States Mr Lewis's book on America had been suppressed. Looking to these facts, was this a time for sending out remonstrance after remonstrance without avail? Was not the time come when they should rather declare that the Free Church could have no intercourse with them on equal terms, that it could only remain in a friendly intercourse with the view of pointing out to them

their sin? (Applause.) Let the Free Church follow the example of the United Secession, the Relief Body, the Methodist Conference, and other religious denominations in this country, who had all declared they could have no intercourse with the American churches which countenanced slavery. The Evangelical Alliance had taken up that principle, for it appeared that Dr Candlish there moved to the effect that those divines who held property in man should be excluded. Now, the erastian ministers of the Church of Scotland had been invited to the Alliance, while, on the other hand, those clergymen connected with slaveholding churches received no invitation. Surely that showed that the Alliance, at least, considered the erastianism of the latter far greater than that of the former. (Applause.) But a difficulty had been raised as to sending back the money—that they did not know to whom they could send it. He would show them how they could at once get quit of this difficulty. Ten thousand slaves had lately crossed the Canadian frontier, who were in a state of great physical as well as spiritual destitution; so they could send back the money to-morrow. (Great applause.) He entertained the highest respect for the leaders of the church; but he thought they would best show true magnanimity if they would adopt the principles which he defended, confess themselves to be in the wrong, and take a more scriptural position in all time to come. (Great applause.) Mr Macbeth concluded by reading a motion to the effect, that whereas the accursed system of slavery, in the slave States of America, is peculiarly atrocious; and whereas the whole traffic in slaves necessarily incurs a great crime on the individual who partakes in it; and whereas the churches in America obtained light on this point, but had since departed from it, and notwithstanding the repeated remonstrances made to them, continue to countenance slavery, this church resolve not to admit to its communion table any person belonging to those churches, or receive a deputation from churches which do not excommunicate those who deal in slaves.

Dr DUNCAN said, there were three questions involved in the subject before the house, all having a near relation to each other, but still distinct and separate questions. These were, first, the system of slavery itself; second, the duty of Christian men and Christian churches, where slavery exists, in regard to it; and third, the duty of Christian men and Christian churches, in their conduct towards those churches. The last was the question which the house had immediately to do with. It was clear that the American churches could not abolish slavery; their business was to do all they could to obtain its abolition, and the part of the church in this country to stimulate them to do so. Now, he thought that the Free Church could do something to forward the abolition, by maintaining the relation which existed between it and the American churches. However, should they prove slow to hear and slow to learn, the time might come when the church would be called upon to say, we can have no longer communion with you. (Applause.) There certainly was a very clear distinction between a slaveholder and a man who willingly set his slave free, but whom the law sent back upon his hand; such a person could not be looked upon as holding property in man. The learned Doctor concluded by complaining that there should be in certain quarters an appearance to coerce the Free Church in the management of its matters, and in the pursuit of that course which, according to divine institute, it thought best fitted to attain the end which it had as strongly and decidedly in view as any body whatever. (Applause.)

Dr CUNNINGHAM next rose, and was received with loud applause. He said he believed he had the honour of having introduced into the Free Church what some called *pro*-slavery views, though, of course, there were no persons in the Free Church who believed it. All who had paid the least attention to the proceedings of that church

ever since the matter had been brought before it, must have remarked that there was no real or substantial difference of opinion on the subject among its leaders, and that he (Dr C.) never had the least hesitation in fully declaring his thorough conviction that the system of slavery was sinful, because inconsistent with the ordinary and natural rights of man; opposed to the general bearing and spirit of the Word of God, and most injurious to the interests of religion. He entirely agreed with Dr Candlish and Dr Duncan in all they had said. According to the temperament of different men, and from incidental circumstances, there might be, it was true, a difference of impression, though none of opinion, as to the particular aspect of the case, but there was no appreciable or substantial difference among them on the great question involved in the whole matter. If there was one point in which his (Dr C.'s) impression differed from some of his brethren, it arose from the circumstance of his having had personal intercourse with their ministers, which had led him to form a favourable opinion of their general character and conduct. He had no hesitation in saying, that there were among them many good Christian ministers. But this belief of his just made him the more desirous of seeing slavery entirely abolished, and more cordially willing to do all in his power that was fit and right to secure that important end. (Applause.) No doubt there was something about the American churches in connection with slavery, which was not very creditable to them, and which injuriously affected their usefulness. As to Mr Macbeth's speech, no doubt the proper *status questionis* had been well brought out, but there was a most egregious failure in the proof which he attempted to adduce. (Hear, hear.) This had already been well disposed of by Dr Duncan, between whom and himself there was no tangible difference. He had read Mr Macbeth's pamphlet, and had heard him last year address the Assembly on the subject, and he certainly did hope that the house would not be doomed to hear the same arguments repeated again. He would just ask, had Mr Macbeth proved that the system of slavery being avowedly a sin, the corollary followed that slaveholding—or as Dr Duncan more properly termed it, slave having—was necessarily also a sin? He (Dr C.) held that *prima facie*, the two points seemed to be involved in each other, and that the *onus probandi* lay with those who maintained his view of the case. Well, he was quite willing to prove that the two points did not involve each other. (Hear, hear.) Suppose that the Parliament of Great Britain passed a law, declaring that from the 1st of June next, all the hired servants of families in the country were to become the slaves or property of their masters, so that the masters were enabled by this law to treat their servants as slaves, after the manner of those in America. Suppose the Queen gave her consent to the statute, from that moment I became a slaveholder—from that moment I could not avoid becoming a slaveholder, in consequence of those whom I hitherto regarded as merely servants, being legally converted into slaves. I would be made a slaveholder by no act of mine, and I don't see how, being thus put in the position of a proprietor in human beings, I therefore, *ipso facto*, became a sinner, if I did not in any one instance make use of the power which the law conferred, but continued to treat my servants exactly in the same way as I treated them before this act was passed. (Great applause.) This was but a common sense view of the case, and he (Dr C.) could not see how any one could maintain that all those men connected with the churches in the slave States of America were, irrespective of circumstances, guilty of any heinous sin or crime, and ought to be treated as such, merely because they continued to stand in the legal relation of slaveholders. Much had

been said about citing Scripture in support of slavery. Now, in regard to this, it was certainly an unquestionable fact, that the Apostles of our Lord and Master admitted slaveholders to the Lord's Table. (An ironical cry of "Hear, hear," supposed to have proceeded from Mr Thompson, which created a slight commotion, accompanied with cries of "Put him out." This threat, however, was not put into execution, as the reverend Doctor was allowed to proceed without farther interruption.) What could they be but slaveholders, when their servants stood in this position, that they could put them to death with legal impunity, though, of course, they did not do it, nor were seeking to do it, but admitted them to Christian communion, and to all the privileges of members of the church. (Hear.) This was a fact which had never been denied by any church, or by any person whose opinions upon the question was entitled to weight. People spoke with feelings of horror about them quoting Scripture to warrant slavery. But if they would consider the Scripture rightly, they would find that what he had said was true, and this was the whole answer they would get. As to the arguments from Scripture of Mr Macbeth, he (Dr C.) had never used them himself, because, like Dr Duncan, he would have been ashamed of them. The reverend Doctor proceeded to combat the critical remarks of Mr Macbeth on the original text of the Bible bearing on the question, and maintained that there could be no doubt that Philemon was a slaveholder, but nevertheless recognised by the apostles as a brother entitled to all the privileges of a member of the Christian church, and that they did not impose on him to manumit his slaves. The rev. Doctor next read the following verses from Timothy:—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort." This clearly applied to slaves; and while the passage contained a declaration as to how the slaves were to be treated, there was nothing at all said as to setting them free. This showed that there must be some distinction between the system of slavery and the individual slaveholder. He could, therefore, establish the position that the system of slavery is sinful; and also establish the position, that slavery is not sinful in such a sense that every slaveholder, as such, should be treated and regarded as a sinner. There were two extremes, with either of which the question could be viewed. The tendency of the pro-slavery men, in the slave States of America, was to adopt the one extreme, and admit, without distinction, all slaveholders to the Lord's Table; and the other extreme was to refuse to take the position which the Apostolic example warranted. He (Dr Cunningham) would recommend that the Free Church should not go to either extreme, but hold both—(hear)—and he rejoiced to think that, as regarded the Free Church, this important scriptural question was now in the hands of men who were competent to look to it in all its aspects; and who would not be prevented by any outward influence or popular clamour from declaring the conscientious convictions of their own minds, as based on the Word of God; and, according to its precepts, following the enlightened and comprehensive way of duty which they owed to other churches of Christ. (Loud applause.) Mr Macbeth had put the case as if they (the Free Church) were members of the American churches. They could not be members of an erastian church, and very possibly there were many things connected with American churches which would prevent them being members of these churches. But that did not prevent them having friendly intercourse with them, or recognising them as churches of Christ. This led to the question of the duty of the churches in America. In the first place, the natural duty was to abolish slavery. The Apostles did not carry on open war against slavery, keep slaveholders from the communion table, or say that slaves should be manumitted. As to the opinion of Dr Andrew Thomson, he (Dr C.) concurred in the statement of that eminent divine which Mr Macbeth had read, but it did not apply to the question agitated. Slavery, no doubt, had a great tendency to bring out all that was corrupt and depraved in the human heart, but then no distinctive sin could be charged against those churches. But let it be kept in constant view, that upon Great Britain and America depends the highest welfare of the human race. These two countries have been granted the largest amount of Christian knowledge and piety, and the fullest development of the truth according to the word. Before, therefore, cutting up all intercourse between the churches, we ought to have clear and strong ground upon which such a proceeding could be defended; some heinous sin—something which forces upon our consciences that there is great guilt on their part, and which would devolve directly upon us, if intercourse with them should be maintained. It is our duty to seek to preserve the intercourse, both for their welfare and for our own; and there can be no doubt that in doing good

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MONTROSE STANDARD.

MR YEDITUR,—On Munonday nicht our Jock gat me enteeced to gang doon an' hear that chi Douglass. I had cam awa' wantin' ma specks; but frae the luik I gat o' him, he seem't a buird fallow, and ane I shouldna like to hae a tussle wi' aither feesecally or intellecktually. But to t' pint on han'. I cam' hame, an' gaed aff to ma bed, leavin' Jock sittin' gey an' dowf-like at the ing cheek. "Jock," quo' I, "gang your wa's to your bed, an' dinna sit there burnin' coal an' caunle f nae en': ye ken that wab maun be feenish't the morn." "Ou aye," quo' he, "nae fear o' the wat Weel, sir, thro' the nicht I'm waukent wi' sumbody roarin' an' singin'. I luiks atower—an' wad believ't?—it was Jock, an' it near twa i' the mornin'. I was in a pashin—nae wunner—a hale penn caunle brunt! "Ye ne'er-do-weel loon," quo' I, raxin' ower the bed for ane o' ma shoon, "sitti squeachin there at this time o' the mornin', disturbin' the hale kintra side—this'll no be the gate o't i' t mornin'—there'll be nae harlin ye oot o' yer bed *than*." Wi' that, Mr Yeditur, I gars the shae pla breenge at his head—it skifft his lug—coupit the caunlestick—bruke twa plates—an' foosh doon th tea-tray wi' a reeshle like thunner. Jock was ben the house like winkin', an' the door bar't. I ras to see th' extent o' the dawmage, an' fell in wi' the followin' poyem, whilk Jock had drappit in h flicht. Wad ye juist stap it oot o' the gate sume way, Mr Yeditur, for I canna luk at it withou thinkin' o' the plates. And oblige,

LINKS, *March*, 1846. SAUNDERS KENEYEQUHAE.

THE BOY TAMMY'S MEDITATIONS.

ONY TUNE YE LIKE.

(The Poet indulgeth in the descriptive.)

Oh, Tammy sat lane by his ain fireside,
He luikit dumfounder't—he graned and he sigh'd
As he shuke his lang pow—the tears pappin' doun came—
"There'll never be peace till *that* siller's sent hame."

(Moral reflections aboot scourin' bluidy bawbees.)

"I ha'e scoor'd thae bawbees till blabs stan' on my broo—
I may scoor a' my days, but the bluid aye keeks thro';
I maun e'en sen' them back, just to please oor auld dame,
For she'll no be at peace till that siller's sent hame."

(A case o' conscience.)

"Send it hame: lat me see—it gangs sair 'gainst my heart;
But it's better wi' siller than conscience to pairt;
Can we haud be't? Na! Douglass has blawn sic' a flame,
That we winna hae peace till that siller's sent hame."

(A predic'.)

"It's hard, unco hard, to confess we've dune wrang;
Ane micht do't—but, oh, *an Assembly!*—ma sang!
But oor folk are uproarious, and cry 'What a shame,'
And they'll no gi'e us peace till that siller's sent hame."

(A dreary prospect.)

"I ken I've dune wrang—the warl' maks sic a din;
Nae smile frae *withoot*, and nae comfort *within;*
The deed stamps eternal disgrace on my name,
And I winna hae peace till that siller's sent hame."

(No go.)

"Thae chiels in Dundee, tho' weel gifted wi' gab,
May talk of the slave-holding patriarch, Job;
They may range the hale Bible—it comes a' to the same—
There'll never be peace till the siller's sent hame."

("Random Recollections.")

"I've play'd mony a queer pliskie, I trow, in my day;
I've belauber't *Dissenters*—weel, weel, let *that* gae;
I've run aff frae my Granny, but I've stain'd my fair fame,
And I'll never ha'e peace till that siller's sent hame."

(Reel reminiscences.)

"I've danc'd mony a queer reel—aye, and danc'd them wi' pride,
But this is the daftest like *e'er* I ha'e tried;
For The Slavery Strathspey—a *back step*—(sic a name!)—
Maun be danc'd to the tune o' 'Send that siller hame.'"

(A melancholy state of affairs.)

"My mither cries, 'Tammy, correct the mistak"—
As usual, there's 'Patterraw John'* at my back;
While 'The Slave' redds my hair wi' his murderous kaim,
And'll no be at peace till that siller's sent hame."

("Ah, Tam! ah, Tam!")

"My mither!—puir body!—shares a' my disgrace:
Wi' a tear in her ee, she aye glow'rs in my face;
She gangs aboot dowie, and greetin' for shame,
And she'll no gi'e me peace till that siller's sent hame."

(Tammy jocosely addresseth himself.)

"Aye, Tammy, ma man, ye've a will o' your ain;
To 'Retract e'en a hairbreadth,' I ken gies ye pain;
But, I doot, ye maun do't, tho' 'twad coup ilka 'scheme,
For there'll never be peace till that siller's sent hame.

(Visions.)

Wi' a heartrendin' sigh, and a shak' o' his head,
Tammy, sairly perplex't, slippit aff till his bed;
But he raved in his sleep, and cried oot in his drame,
"THERE'LL NEVER BE PEACE TILL THAT SILLER'S SENT HAME."

* Dr Ritchie.

Very opposite opinions have been entertained in this country respecting the merits, or the demerits, of that class of persons who, in America, have usurped to themselves the name of slavery "*Abolitionists*." Notwithstanding the very decided condemnation of them expressed by judges the most competent, who had witnessed their proceedings in America,—a few individuals amongst us were still slow to relinquish the favourable impressions at first awakened, on this side of the Atlantic, by their lofty pretensions; and we know not how long some such feelings might have lingered, had not the "Abolitionists," in a happy hour, sent over a sample of themselves for our inspection, which has put all doubt or delicacy on the subject to flight, at once and for ever.

The Free Church, as is well known, had not fashioned certain of her proceedings according to the maxims of the so-called "Abolitionists";—and the object of the present auspicious mission, therefore, has been to rebuke her presumption, and chastise her into submission. After skulking about, for several weeks, in some of our provincial towns,—holding meetings in *certain* Dissenting chapels, and in one instance (as we have been told)—where no Dissenting minister could be found to incur the discredit of their fellowship—actually finding honourable entertainment in *an Established Church!*—Mr. Douglass (the black) and Mr. *Buffum*,—reinforced by another American of the name of Wright, and by Mr. George Thompson, from London,—have at length come forth into the full blaze of our City Hall, and there presented an exhibition, which will satisfactorily settle the merits of them and the "Abolitionists" in all time coming. Mr. Wright opened their meeting by telling his auditors—"*Scotland is in a blaze!*—The word has gone forth, and has been echoed *through glens and from mountain to mountain all over Scotland*, saying to the Free Church—'Send back the money—*annul the covenant with death.*'" A fair specimen this (we presume) of American oratory and American accuracy. The "blaze" and the "echoes" of Mr. Wright have no existence; and he will speedily discover that the *only* "blaze" that he or his friends are capable of raising in Scotland is one very different from what they have anticipated.

Our difference with the so-called "Abolitionists" is neither about the nature or character of slavery,—especially of American slavery,—which we hold to be a system of the most horrid iniquity—peculiarly disgraceful to a nation which boasts (forsooth) of being the freest of the free—nor yet about the propriety and necessity of "abolishing" that most abominable system, in America, and everywhere else on the face of the earth. Our only difference with them respects *the mode of prosecuting that object*; and—so far as we have any influence, or any means of interference, towards the forwarding of that most desirable end, we cannot, and will not, take the "Aboli-

tionists' " method of dealing with it,—which, we think, combines every possible fault,—being (as we humbly think) unsound in principle, unchristian in spirit, and practically calculated to obstruct and impede the very end at which it professes to aim.

Upon the occurrence of the memorable Disruption,—when 470 of our ministers relinquished their all, that they might assert the spiritual freedom of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland,—the event was hailed with enthusiasm throughout the wide extent of Protestant Christendom, and letters were showered upon us from all quarters, expressing an intense desire to be informed respecting all that was involved in the occurrence, together with the warmest sympathy in our sufferings, and an earnest wish to render us assistance in the gigantic effort of at once rearing 600 or 700 churches for our afflicted congregations. In particular, numerous communications of this description were received from America,—of which a considerable portion came from the southern and western states of the Union,—where, though slavery has been recognised and established by law, and has pervaded the whole system of society, for centuries, there still exists a large number of congregations, belonging to the Presbyterian, Methodist, and other religious denominations,—and whose members consist (as they have always done, and as they must continue to do, so long as the present state of the law and of society remains), of the owners of slaves and of the slaves themselves. Some of these communications were accompanied with liberal donations, spontaneously raised and transmitted, as tokens of brotherly affection, in our time of need. In compliance with the urgent requisitions thus received, a deputation, consisting of four or five of our ministers, proceeded to America,—two of whom only (unless we are mistaken) visited any of the slave-holding states,—Mr. Chalmers (as we think) having gone as far as to Charleston, and Mr. Lewis having extended his journey to New Orleans and the Valley of the Mississippi,—as is well known from the interesting and instructive volume which he has given to the public. Every where our ministers were received with the utmost cordiality; and wherever they went, they preached the gospel to the people, explained the great principles of our controversy, and received whatsoever collections were made by the congregations; these collections, in the Southern States, being necessarily composed chiefly of the offerings of slaveholders and the slaves in the several congregations of which they happened to be members. The total sum obtained throughout the Union was, we believe, between £10,000 and £11,000, of which about £3000 is supposed to have proceeded from the slave-holding states.

Previous to the disruption, our Church had had little or no direct communication with the Churches of America,—as was true in relation to various other distant Churches, with which that event was the happy means of bringing

us, for the first time, into closer fellowship. We were no doubt aware that slavery existed by law over a large portion of the American Union, and we needed no one to inform us of the abominations of that system, or of the desirableness of its extinction. But it most certainly never occurred to our ministers,—when visiting that country for the first time, and in the interesting circumstances to which we have referred,—that it could possibly be expedient, or reconcileable with the plainest principles of Christian duty, to *excommunicate* Christian congregations, because they existed in a country groaning under the legal institution of slavery, or to commit the greatest of all outrages, by flinging in their faces the offerings of their Christian sympathy and affection. However great may be the horrors of slavery, and however tremendous the disadvantages under which Christianity must labour, in a country where slavery is maintained and enforced by law,—it could not but occur to any man, of the most ordinary reflection, that that system being inveterate in the American States,—having been originally established there by the force of British law, and ever since maintained by the civil rulers of the country with unabated tenacity, the Christian congregations formed under such circumstances could not, by possibility, be responsible for its existence,—however they might unfortunately suffer in some of their Christian sensibilities from its existence in the midst of them, and that, if any good was to be done by strangers, in preparing either masters or slaves for the extinction of the evil,—it was to be effected, not by rude and unchristian contempt, but by patient representations, and by firm and affectionate remonstrances. It was impossible also to forget that, within these very few years, the very same system which exists in these States of America, existed in our own West India Colonies,—that at that time *slaveholders dwelt among ourselves*, — some of them men of *the very highest Christian worth*, taking a zealous part in every work of Christian usefulness — members and *elders* of our several churches—nay, that *Missionary Societies received most gratefully*, from such individuals, *large annual sums of money* ("bloodstained dollars" as they are now called), *to be expended in affording Christian instruction to the very slaves belonging to these excellent and most esteemed individuals;* and—when such had been our uninterrupted and unquestioned course of acting towards slave-owners, dwelling among ourselves —with what reason or consistency could we turn round upon the Americans, *placed in circumstances infinitely more difficult and trying than we ever were*, and not only excommunicate *every individual slaveholder among them*, but excommunicate (as we are required to do) *every entire church that admits a single slave-owner to remain within its fellowship*—thus exacting from them a monstrous and unheard of cruelty that we never for one moment dreamt of practising among ourselves?

It was impossible for any Church, or for any body of reasonable men, to be guilty of such an outrage; and our Church, therefore,—availing herself of the favourable opportunity afforded by the circumstances; lost no time in forwarding to the Churches in the slave-holding States in America—an earnest and affectionate remonstrance, in which she represented to them that "natural reason, sound policy, a sense of justice between man and man, as well as the whole tenor and spirit of the Divine word, and especially of the dispensation of the gospel, concur in condemning slavery;" * * and that "it is, therefore, with the deepest pain that every rightly constituted Christian mind must contemplate the continued and tolerated existence of it in the United States of America."—Having farther stated that "it is the duty of Christian Churches, as such, to set themselves against the manifold abuses of slavery, and to aim decidedly at its abolition, and that she cannot conceive of Christian Churches giving their sanction to this institution, without a painful apprehension of the responsibility which they must in that case incur"—she "most affectionately and most earnestly represented to them the great risk and damage of partaking in this evil, the duty of their considering seriously the best way in which a stand may be made against it, and the importance of a general united testimony, and united action, in regard to it, among all the Churches of Christ." Our Church repeated her testimony, in still more decided terms, at last meeting of the General Assembly, twelve months ago;—and we doubt not she will continue to press her remonstrances with all the earnestness that the urgency of the case so justly demands. We rejoice, in the meantime, to know, that her representations have been received and responded to in the best possible spirit, and that (notwithstanding all the obstructions thrown in the way by misdirected zeal and the most furious and unjustifiable passions) the cause of liberty gains ground rapidly throughout the Union, so as to encourage the most strenuous exertions in hope of its speedy triumph.

Such have been the proceedings of the Free Church, in relation to the Churches in the slave-holding states of America. But, unfortunately, these proceedings do not suit the views of Messrs. Wright, Buffum, Thompson and Co. Imbued with the exalted spirit of American "abolitionism,"—these gentlemen cut off from *their* pure and untainted fellowship, not only every slave-holder, but every Church that admits a single slave-holder;—alleging, with true Christian humility and meekness, that they, for "their parts, do not look upon *any* slave-holder as being a Christian *at all*;" and because the Free Church has presumed to take a different view of her duty, in such matters,—the following is a specimen of the manner in which she is to be drilled by these eminent and accomplished Christians. The Free Church, it seems, by her proceedings, has made "*a covenant with man-stealers*" (in another

place called "a covenant *with hell!*"), the effect of which *is to put into the hands of Drs. Chalmers, Cunningham, and Candlish, and of the Free Church over which they preside, the slave-driver's lash and fetter, and they are now using them, in conjunction with their allies, the slave-drivers and slave-breeders of America, upon the backs and limbs of the American slaves!*" "*The slave-driving and slave-breeding compact!*—(again exclaims Mr. Wright)—let them annul that, and I ask no more. But, oh! exclaim the trio of Doctors—if we give up the fellowship, *we must send back the money!*" In the name (adds Mr. Wright) of all that "is honest and of good report," *and of Him who came to enthrone God in heaven, and abolish slavery on earth*, I (Mr. Henry Wright) say to them—"*send back the money!*" "As they (the ministers of the Free Church) see slavery in the institution, they charge him (it) with adultery, incest, blasphemy, theft, robbery, and murder; but as they see him in the slave-holders, they baptise, license, and ordain him. As seen in the institution, they say unto him, '*Depart ye wicked into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels!*'—but as they see him in slave-holding Presbyterians, *with pockets full of dollars, ready to be poured into their building fund, they say*, '*Come ye blessed—enter into the kingdom prepared for you!!!*'" In drawing a distinction between slavery as a system, and the individuals who have had the misfortune to be nursed and fashioned under its influence, Dr. Chalmers is guilty of "a *subterfuge*,"—of "a *puerile and bare-faced expedient!*" "*Do these men* (of the Free Church) *believe there is a God?—In words* they do; but in their apologies for slave-holders, *they deny him.*" "*Cease your talk* about your purity, the honour, glory, and crown rights of the Redeemer, so long as you are in league with men-stealers, leprous with sin, and while you have the blood-stained dollars of your allies in your coffers,—for your hands wield the cow-skin over the back, and clank the fetter around the limbs of the slave!" "To the Free Church, *God says*—'Bring no more vain oblations, your Sabbaths and your solemn meetings are an abomination unto me—*your hands are full of blood—send back the money—cease to do evil, learn to do well*,'" &c. &c. In the opinion of Mr. Douglass (the black man) the Free Church deputation, "in the course they took to get money to build Free Churches and to pay Free ministers—*acted more like thieves than Christian ministers!*" "The defenders of the Free Church have had *to upset all the first principles of Christianity!* and to adopt the principles of the *infidels!* of the *Socialists!* and others; and have *brought a foul blot on Christianity!!*" "Dr. Chalmers and his Divine Master are *at odds*," and the Rev. Doctor is "*the artful dodger!*" Mr. *Buffum* is resolved not to be behind his friends, for he tells us that the deputation "partook of the Lord's supper *with thieves, and shook hands with adulterers!*" "*Nothing was sufficient to restrain their rapacity for dollars*, and soon we saw these champions of freedom,—these paragons of piety—*bowing down to the Moloch of slavery, and wor-*

shipping before its blood-stained altar!" And Mr. George Thompson, with glowing and indignant oratory, exclaims—"*Oh, horrible impiety! Oh, wicked inconsistency! Oh, monstrous and iniquitous union, of light and darkness, Christ and Belial!* Ministers and members of Scotland's Free Church, *I (Mr. George Thompson) tell you* from this place *(the City Hall!)*, that, while you retain in your treasury one farthing of the money taken from the slaveholders of America, *the curse of the slave, and the righteous indignation of the slave's God, are upon you*," &c. &c. &c. "You *must* (he tells us farther) put on *the sackcloth of repentance*, you *must* confess that you have *sinned*, you *must* acknowledge that you have been driven into *an unholy compact*," &c. And again he bursts forth—"*Oh! the accursed gold!*"—(that is to say, this £3000, out of *the four thousand pounds* which the Church has raised for church building *alone*)—"*Oh!* that three thousand pounds outweigh the claims of three millions of slaves," and so on he goes,—lecturing the Free Church to repent *in time*," and *warning* her that "*it is even now* (now that Mr. George Thompson has appeared in the City Hall) *almost too late to retrieve her character;* and beseeching all true Christians "*to come out from such a Church*, to be *separate* from it, to *touch not the unclean thing*, to *wash their hands in innocency*," &c. &c. &c.

We ought to apologise to our readers for blotting our paper with such a tissue of ravings. But we are anxious that our readers, once for all, should see these men, and understand them. And, assuming these individuals to furnish us (as we suppose we may) with a fair specimen of American "abolitionism,"—our readers are now in a situation to judge for themselves how far Dr. Cunningham did not give us a very just account of the general character of the body, when he told us "it was *altogether impossible* to talk of them with respect, or to have the least regard for their judgment, *sanity*, or sense." Our readers may naturally be inclined to ask—who and what in the world can these four men be, or suppose themselves to be? And that question we may, perhaps, answer more fully at another time. For the present, we shall only say that Mr. Douglass (the black) was (as he himself tells us) a "chimney-sweeper," when the Abolitionists promoted him to the questionable honour of being one of their orators, and sent him forth to try his hand in throwing dirt at Dr. Chalmers; and as to the whole party, they have made it very manifest, by their exhibition in the City Hall, that they altogether form a set most pre-eminently qualified to instruct Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Gordon, and their whole brotherhood on subjects of Christian ethics, and the duties and discipline of the Christian Church.

We should be glad to know what this "Glasgow Eman-

THE FREE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland has closed its important deliberations, and there are several points of social and ecclesiastical importance to which we purpose, on public grounds, to invite the early attention of our readers. We now, pursuant to our promise, record their proceedings on the question—difficult and delicate, we admit—of their continued intercourse with Presbyterian churches in America; and we desire to assure all whom it may concern that our desire is to deal with this question in a spirit of fairness and impartiality.

Several communications from public bodies had been submitted to the Moderator; but, not having been laid before the business committee, they could not, according to usage, be brought before the court. This is a convenient, but not very dignified, mode of dealing with papers emanating from public societies. Overtures, however, from some of their inferior courts did claim the attention of the Assembly, and on these they founded their deliverance.

The decision of the Assembly was—not "to send back the money"—not to express regret that they had taken it—not to refuse to hold fellowship with the churches in America, even with those whose ministers and members may be slave-holders; but faithfully to admonish those churches that in sanctioning slavery they are sanctioning a heinous sin, and that their duty is to seek, by moral and constitutional means, the early abolition of that system. This is in advance of any step they had previously taken, and shows that they have been benefited by recent agitation. Indeed, though Dr. CANDLISH may boast of their determination not to yield to the "clamour of the mob," it is very evident that they have yielded to "the pressure from without."

The speech of Dr. CANDLISH was very ingenious and very able, and we feel persuaded that if his brethren had now to commence their American peregrinations they would confine their appeals to the churches of the north. Here, we think, they erred in the outset. Without stopping to discuss the question of the propriety of taking spontaneous offerings from churches in the south, we can entertain no doubt of the inexpediency—we use the word in its best sense—of asking money for religious purposes from men, every dollar in whose purse is stained with human blood. They were wrong, and they ought to have owned their error.

Nor is this all. Several of them have endeavoured to justify this act; and in their zeal to defend their delegates they have used language, and resorted to reasoning, which would lead, if legitimately carried out, to a defence of slavery. This for their own sake, and for the sake of a good cause, we deeply regret; and we warn them to guard against this error.

We deem it highly probable that their fellowship with the churches in the slave states will speedily cease, though not by an act of their own. These churches will not bear the kind of remonstrance which the Free Church is now pledged to employ. The report presented to the Assembly was to the effect—"That although the American letter contains 'a clear and unequivocal disapproval of the system of slavery,' yet, 'the committee find several points in it on which they cannot agree with their brethren,' and are of opinion that the committee should be instructed, in preparing a reply, to 'take care that this Church's views on the subject of the sin and evil of slavery, and the duty of Christian Churches and individuals to aim at its speedy abolition, should be explicitly brought out, with all tenderness towards those who have to consider this question in such difficult circumstances as those in which the American Churches are placed, and with all faithfulness to the truth of GOD, as involved in this important matter.'"

The tenor of Dr. C.'s argument may be gathered from the following passage:—"Let that Church be ever so guilty in any particular matter that may be urged against her, we are not yet, I say, at that stage at which the question arises of our ceasing to have friendly intercourse with her. For I say, that the very last step which any church should take, or is entitled to take, in the way of dealing with a sister Church, with which, in the Providence of GOD, she has been brought into connexion,—I say the very last step the Church is entitled to take, is the step of renouncing friendly intercourse. She has a variety of duties incumbent on her to that Church with which she has been brought into connexion. She has a variety of duties incumbent upon her; and she may not even listen to the proposal of breaking off all friendly intercourse, except as a proposal in the last resort, and after she has discharged all her other duties to that Church."

Since that speech was delivered the Assembly has had under its attention the draught of the official letter proposed to be forwarded to the Presbyterian Assembly in America. Mark the elevation of its moral tone. Notice the plainness, the fidelity, with which they now address their Transatlantic friends. In their published proceedings they tell us that "Dr. CANDLISH, on the part of

the committee appointed to prepare a letter to the Presbyterian Church of the United States, in answer to the letter received from them, read the draught of the proposed answer to be transmitted in reply. The answer impressed upon the American Churches the duty of their seeking for the abolition of the system of slavery, and made special reference to the law of the United States on the subject of the marriage, education, and emancipation of the slaves, and expressed it as the opinion of the Free Church that the law on these points was most objectionable. The draught embraced the views sketched in Dr. CANDLISH'S speech on Saturday. The report was approved of, and power was given to the committee to make any verbal alterations. The answer was approved of and adopted, and was remitted to the committee, that' after making such verbal alterations as might appear necessary, they might transmit it to the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America. The Moderator was authorized to subscribe the letter in name of the Assembly."

A communication of this kind, and especially from the Free Church of Scotland, will produce no ordinary sensation among the churches in the Southern States; and will lead, we venture to think, to an early cessation of ecclesiastical fellowship. We would confidently hope, that all these efforts may lead to one grand consummation—the speedy and the peaceful termination of American slavery. Good men may differ in their views of the best modes to be adopted for the accomplishment of this object. Churches may take—conscientiously take—different courses in their intercourse with their American brethren: the Secession and Relief Churches may resolve—as they have resolved—to have no fellowship, no communion with the American churches; while the Free Church may resolve to maintain the fellowship, and to record their protest against slavery: but let all unite in one grand effort to abolish the enormity. Friends of freedom—friends of man, we appeal to you all; sink your differences, and resolve never to relax in your efforts, nor to swerve from your purpose, until slavery, through every part of the American Union, shall cease and determine.

THE FREE CHURCH DEFENDING SLAVERY!

Strange and startling as the fact may seem to many, the Free Church of Scotland, in its supreme legislative assembly, has come forth to sanction and defend slavery. While all other denominations have seen it their duty to protest against that foul system, and to withhold all fellowship from such as partake of its guilty gains, the Free Church has thought fit to act otherwise, and has unblushingly proffered the right hand of fellowship and affection to their confessedly sinful brethren of the Presbyterian faith in the United States! Such is the sum and substance of the decision recorded in the proceedings of that body, at Edinburgh, on Saturday last, and which may well excite the just indignation of Christendom.

The subject was introduced to the Assembly by the presentation of various petitions from Free Churchmen and others, craving a firm protest against American slavery. Dr. Candlish, whose opinions on most matters, whether political or ecclesiastical, have never been remarkably liberal, then entered minutely into the subject—professed his abhorrence of the sin of slavery—his anxiety for its abolition, and the necessity of always testifying against it; but here, alas! the good man's consistency forsook him, and he gravely announced his discovery, that, though slavery, in itself, *was sinful*, *slaveholding was not*, and therefore—mark the inference—the Free Church should retain the money it had gathered in the slave states of America, and continue, uninterruptedly and pleasantly, its fellowship with the slaveholding ministers and members of the Presbyterian churches in that country! To this miserable quibbling and outrageous doctrine, only one member of the Assembly, (Mr Macbeth, of Glasgow,) ventured to dissent; and he, of course, had little power to withstand the influence and persuasion—not the logic—of the great dictator and leader of the denomination.

Dr. Cunningham, another leader of the Free Church, though much less popular than the first, seconded Dr. Candlish's views, and even went somewhat farther, endeavouring to justify them in a manner that cannot be regarded as anything else than gross profanity. In order, however, that our readers may judge for themselves, let them read what follows:—

"Much had been said about citing Scripture in support of slavery. Now, in regard to this, it was certainly an unquestionable fact, that *the Apostles of our Lord and Master admitted slaveholders to the Lord's Table*—(an ironical cry of "Hear, hear," from a stentorian voice at the north side of the house, which created a slight commotion in that quarter; accompanied with cries of "put him out." This threat, however, was not put into execution, as the rev. doctor was allowed to proceed without farther interruption.) What could they be but slaveholders, when their servants stood in this position, that

THE FREE KIRK AND SLAVEHOLDING.

AMONG the many extraordinary things which occurred in the Free Assembly on the memorable 30th of May, not the least remarkable was the distinction attempted to be drawn betwixt slave-*holding* and slave-*having*. We think it was Dr Duncan, that reverend recanter, who had the merit of discovering this nice distinction,—so nice that it requires the emancipated understanding of a Free Kirk-man to find it out. It seems, then, that a man may *have* a slave without being a slave-*holder*; and the Churches in America being merely slave-havers are guilty of no sin at all. Unfortunately this argument, like most bad arguments, proves too much; for if these Churches are merely slave-havers, and if slave-having be no sin, then there was no occasion for the "faithful testimony" which was to do so much good in the way of bringing these Churches to a right mind. But it is idle to waste time in weighing an argument which the common sense of every man in the kingdom perceives to be a paltry quibble. So far as regards the question at issue, slave-holding and slave-having are one and the same thing; and if any man *has* slaves who does not wish to *hold* them, then let him prove that there is a difference, by giving to his fellow-creatures that liberty which God has given them, and which no human being has any right to withhold. But we are not yet done with Dr Candlish and his "new theology." Not only did this distinguished divine see no cause to regret the connection which the Free Church had formed with the Churches in America, but "*they had many things to learn from that Church*, there were *many improvements* which they might adopt from them, standing as they did in a position in some respects of *high superiority to them;* and he believed that in various particulars bearing on *the right conduct of a Church of Christ, they would do well as a Church* to receive their suggestions, to consider them, and *carry them out.*" This is turning the tables with a vengeance! Why, if this be correct, we have been all the while fighting with a shadow. The country has been convulsed from one end to the other through a gross blunder. It is not the American Churches which stand in need of a "faithful testimony," for it seems they are "in a position of high superiority" even to the Free Church,—and if so, how immeasurably superior must they be to all other Churches! Instead of sending over more warnings and admonitions to these "noble Bereans," other Churches should go and learn some of the "many improvements" which might be adopted from them. But stop a little, and you will find the clever Doctor very soon on a different tack. "They were told," he said, "that they looked upon their connection with these Churches as a misfortune, that they some how or other regretted it, and that they felt that they had *got into a scrape.* Even supposing this was the case—even although they found themselves involved in a connection with these Churches which they would now have shunned, they dared not, in the *exercise of that communion* which they should maintain with *the whole body of Christ* (?) cut the connection even with such a Church, *sinning as she might be*, till they

had addressed to her remonstrance after remonstrance, pleading after pleading—till they had fully exhausted their views upon the subject." Now, we defy any mortal man to tell, from these two portions of the same speech, whether, according to Dr Candlish, the American Churches are worthy of praise or blame; whether their conduct in regard to slavery is sinful or not. We have already assumed the former of these alternatives, which the first part of his speech certainly warranted. We shall now suppose the latter; and in this view of the case, we find Dr Candlish shewing a remarkable aversion to "cutting a connection" which has subsisted for little more than two years, that contrasts strongly with his refusal to hold "friendly intercourse" with another Church against which no sin has yet been charged approaching in enormity to that of holding fellow-creatures in a state of slavery. But letting that pass — Dr Candlish considers that the Free Church would not be justified in breaking off the connection with the American Churches "till they had addressed remonstrance after remonstrance, pleading after pleading—till they had fully exhausted their views upon the subject." No words could have described more graphically the urgency of the duty which lay upon the Free Church to lose no time in remonstrating and pleading again and again with their American brethren; and yet how is it possible to reconcile with this state of matters the fact, that the "remonstrance and pleading" which was resolved upon by the Free Assembly of 1845 has never yet crossed the Atlantic? Surely it was the imperative duty of the Free Church, according to the very words of its leader, to "send remonstrance after remonstrance, and pleading after pleading," till they brought their brethren in America to a right mind. And be it remarked, that it was upon the result or rather the effect of these remonstrances that the question of permanent connection, and of course of retaining or returning the money, was to be ultimately decided. How, then, can the Free Church justify herself in the eyes of Christendom in withholding for a whole year her faithful warning, and allowing her American allies to go on in sin. The matter brooks not delay. Slavery is no trivial evil, the consideration of which may be deferred till a more convenient season. It is a question involving the liberty, and with it the happiness, of three millions of our fellow-creatures. A faithful warning sent last year, if it had proved effectual, might have gladdened the hearts of thousands who have since gone to their graves with the brand of slavery upon their foreheads. Is the Free Church afraid that their American brethren are in that state that they "will not endure sound doctrine?" Is she afraid that the effect of her remonstrances will be a separation, and that the effect of a separation will be—that a demand will come from the other side of the Atlantic, still more peremptory than that addressed to her on this, to "SEND BACK THE MONEY." —But we have again exhausted our space.

THE FREE CHURCH AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Another public meeting on this subject, specially to consider the speeches delivered by Drs Cunningham and Candlish in the Free Church Assembly on Saturday, was held in the Music Hall on Tuesday night—Councillor Stott in the chair. Long before the commencement of the proceedings, the hall was crammed in every corner, and many hundreds surrounded the doors, unable to gain admittance.

The CHAIRMAN stated that agreeably to the resolution of last public meeting the memorial to the Assembly of the Free Church, in reference to the question of slavery, was duly given in on Saturday last, but the deputation were not allowed to present it personally. It was, however, acknowledged as having been received, but its contents were never read. He observed that the manner in which the deputation were received at the door of the Free Church Assembly, as well as the way in which that body treated the memorial referred to, was derogatory to the influence and respectability of the body whose sentiments they represented, as well as unbecoming the dignity of the Free Church Assembly. (Shame!) The Chairman likewise intimated to the meeting that the Town Council had resolved, by a majority of 16 to 5, to confer the freedom of the city on their respected friend, George Thompson, Esq. (Great applause.)

Mr GEORGE THOMPSON, on rising, was greeted with enthusiastic applause. He said—Sir, our special and exclusive object to-night is to review the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, in reference to the question of American slavery, and more particularly the addresses delivered by certain leading members of that Assembly on Saturday last. The question destined to agitate the minds of the religious people of this country for some time to come—even as long as things remain in their present position—is, "The Free Church *versus* the Law of God and the Rights of Humanity;"—(cheers)—the question whether the Free Church shall preach a *pro*-slavery or an *anti*-slavery religion to the people of this country? That is the question. On Saturday last, we were asked in a tone of priestly authority, what business we had to meddle with this question, in connection with the Free Church. It was, it was said, a question of inter-communion between church and church; a question of the terms of Christian fellowship; of ecclesiastical administration, which we were neither competent to discuss, nor warranted in discussing. My answer is—we should have left the Free Church to itself if the Free Church had left Slavery alone, in the way of bestowing its smiles and commendations on slaveholders; but that church has arrested the course of justice; it has taken in, and resolved to harbour, the most atrocious criminal on the face of the earth. We are in pursuit of that criminal, who is the enemy of the human race, and we will not consent that he should find a refuge at the communion table of the Free Church of Scotland. (Loud cheers.) Let the Free Church give up this criminal, and our work is done. We say, "Had you never sent your delegates to America, or, when they were there, had they never gone to the South to fellowship the manstealer, and, by so doing, have cast an impediment in the way of the freedom of the slave, we should never have been found in a hostile attitude; but as you and your delegates have done this, and are now pleading for the righteousness of the act, we are at war—a war which will end only with your entire dissolution of the unholy fellowship into which you have entered. (Cheers.) Sir, in the conduct of this

grave controversy, we shall henceforth confine ourselves to the acts of the Assembly, and to the speeches of those who monopolise to themselves the right of directing and controlling the acts of that body. (Cheers.) We shall leave inferior scribes and orators unnoticed. Until the Free Church Assembly shall meet again, our work will be to expose, to counteract, and to uproot what we believe to be the unscriptural and most pernicious doctrines which within the last four days have been preached from the high places of the Free Church. (Cheers.) We will vindicate the rights of man, which we conceive have been assailed by the principles recently promulgated. We will defend the divine benevolence of the gospel, as, we believe, libelled and denied by teachers of theology in the Free Church. We will put it to the people of Great Britain, whether they will prefer the doctrines of Drs Candlish and Cunningham—that a man may be an innocent slaveholder; or the law of the living God, which declares that he who is found with a man in his hand shall surely be put to death. (Loud cheers.) This is the work we have to do; and it is a work from which we will not shrink—a work in which we will not relax our efforts, till the voice of Scotland, as the voice of one man, shall proclaim that the doctrines recently preached are alike contrary to the law and the gospel, are an outrage upon the rights of human beings, and an insult to the common sense of the community. (Loud cheers.) As the leaders in the Free Church have recently been presenting to their followers a kind of slavery and a sort of slaveholder which have no existence except in the brains of those who for two years have been cudgelling their wits to find an excuse for their own derelictions of duty in the cause of the captive, I will ask your attention to a description of slavery, taken from a book which will not be accused of containing the extreme and extravagant views of abolitionists. Here is a volume, entitled *The Law of Slavery*, compiled by a United States counseller, and published at New York and New Orleans. What I am about to read, is part of a deliberate judgment, pronounced by a United States judge in North Carolina, in 1829, when an appeal case came before him. Mr Thompson here read the entire judgment in the case, from which we extract the more important passages, relating to the actual condition of the slave, and the relation in which he stands to his master, or to the person to whom he is hired out:—

"Our laws uniformly treat the master, or OTHER PERSON having the possession and command of the slave, *as entitled to the* SAME EXTENT *of authority*. The object is the same—*the service of the slave*; and the *same powers* must be confided. In a criminal proceeding, and indeed in reference to all other persons but the general owner, *the hirer* and possessor of the slave, in relation to both rights and duties, is, *for the time being*, the OWNER. Upon the general question, whether the owner is answerable *criminaliter*, for a battery upon his own slave, or other exercise of authority or force, not forbidden by statute, the court entertains but little doubt. That he is so liable, *has never been decided*; nor, as far as is known, been *hitherto contended*. THERE HAS BEEN NO PROSECUTION OF THE SORT. The established habits and uniform practice of the country in this respect, is the best evidence of the *portion of power* deemed by the whole community *requisite* to the *preservation* of the *master's dominion*. If we thought *differently*, we could not set our notions in array against the judgment of every body else, and say that this or that authority may be safely lopped off. This has indeed been assimilated at the bar to the other *domestic relations*; and arguments drawn from the well established principles, which confer and restrain the authority of the *parent* over the *child*, the *tutor* over the *pupil*, the *master* over the *apprentice*, have been pressed on us. The court does not recognise their application. THERE IS NO LIKENESS BETWEEN THE CASES. They are in opposition to each other, and there is *an impassable gulf between them*. The

difference is that which exists between FREEDOM and SLAVERY,—and *a greater cannot be imagined.* In the one, the end in view is the *happiness* of the youth born to *equal rights* with the governor, on whom the duty devolves of training the young to usefulness, in a station which he is afterwards to assume among freemen. To such an end, and with such a subject, moral and intellectual instruction seems the natural means; and for the most part they are found to suffice. Moderate force is superadded, only to make the others effectual. If that fail, it is better to leave the party to his own headstrong passions and the ultimate correction of the law, than to allow it to be immoderately inflicted by a private person. *With slavery it is far otherwise.* The end is *the profit of the master;* HIS security, and the public safety; the subject (the slave), one DOOMED, in his *own person* and *his posterity,* to live WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE, and without the capacity to make anything his own, and to toil that another may reap the fruits. What moral considerations shall be addressed to such a being, to convince him, what it is impossible but that the most stupid must feel and know can never be true, that HE is thus to labour upon a principle of natural duty, or for the sake of his own personal happiness. Such services can only be expected from one who has no will of his own; who surrenders his will in implicit obedience to that of another. *Such obedience* is the consequence only of *uncontrolled authority over the body.* There is nothing else which can operate to produce the effect. *The power of the master must be* ABSOLUTE, to render the *submission of the slave* PERFECT. I most freely confess my sense of *the harshness of this proposition.* I feel it as deeply as any man can; and as a principle of *moral right,* every person in his retirement *must repudiate it.* But in the ACTUAL condition of things, IT MUST BE SO. There is no remedy. *This discipline belongs to the state of slavery.* They cannot be disunited, without abrogating at once the rights of the master, and absolving the slave from his subjection. It constitutes the curse of slavery to both the bond and the free portions of our population. But it is inherent in the relation of master and slave. The truth is, that *we are forbidden to enter upon a train of general reasoning on the subject. We cannot allow the right of the master to be brought into discussion in the courts of justice.* The slave, to remain a slave, must be made sensible that there is *no appeal from his master;* that his person is, in no instance, usurped; but is *conferred by the law of man,* at least, if not by the law of God. The danger would be great, indeed, if the tribunals of justice should be called on to graduate the punishment appropriate to every temper, and every dereliction of menial duty. No man can anticipate the many and aggravated provocations of the master, which the slave would be constantly stimulated, by his own passions, or the instigation of others, to give; or the consequent wrath of the master, prompting him to bloody vengeance, upon the turbulent traitor,—*a vengeance generally practised* WITH IMPUNITY, by reason of its privacy. The court, therefore, disclaims the power of changing the relation in which these parts of our people stand to each other.'

(The reading of this judgment produced considerable sensation.) Here, continued Mr Thompson, you have a delineation of slavery by the hand of a slaveholding judge. This is the condition of every slave in the hands of those whom the Free Church have taken into her communion. Such is the actual relation subsisting between master and slave—a relation which Dr Candlish not only says is, in certain circumstances, innocent, but which in certain circumstances it would be sin in the master to dissolve. I cannot too strongly urge upon you the remembrance of what I have now read. I confess that no document I ever perused gave me a more appalling idea of slavery than this judicial decision from the lips of a slaveholding judge. This is slavery in reality—the slavery

upheld by America, and now unhappily wedded to the Free Church of Scotland by the bonds of an affectionate and Christian communion. Judge ye, my intelligent and Christian friends, whose soul-stirred pleadings with the General Assembly have recently been elegantly characterised by Dr Candlish as "the clamours of a mob," whether we are the enemies of the Free Church, because we ask her, in the name of whatever is lovely and of good report, to break the bonds which unite her to this almost worse than infernal system. (Loud cheers.) You at least can absolve yourselves from this covenant with death, this agreement with hell. Haste, I beseech you, to do so. Let not Dr Candlish, or the Free Church, be the link to bind you to a system so truly dreadful as that which has been revealed in the case I have disclosed. Let me now rapidly sketch the past history of this painful question. The Free Church, emerging from the struggle, looked around her for the sympathy and pecuniary aid of other churches. Her own adherents came forward, and with a degree of generosity and zeal, never exceeded since apostolical days, poured out their wealth like water. While the rich gave of their abundance, the poor contributed of their poverty, and we were invoked to witness the advent of a pure protesting independent church, whose pride and glory it should be to bear the name of The People's Church. England was called upon to help, and England answered to the call. Ireland was appealed to, and Ireland answered. At length, a deputation to the United States was determined upon. A word here. The leaders in the Free Church knew, or professed to know, the true state of the slaveholding churches of that country. Why do I say so? Because, for ten years they had been holding up those churches to the loathing and abhorrence of the Christian people of this land. (Cheers.) Why do I say so? Because some, at least, of these very gentlemen invited me to lecture to themselves and to their people on the state of those churches, and heard from my lips the very statements I have made in your city during the last month. Because they printed, published, and recommended a book which I was the means of introducing to their notice, in which the mystery of iniquity was revealed, and in which the cure prescribed was peremptory excommunication. (Cheers.) The *Scottish Guardian* bears witness against them, that they were not ignorant. *Bourne's Picture of Slavery*, given by them to the people of Scotland, bears witness against them. The walls and pulpit of the West Church bear witness against them. Their own sermons and speeches, for nearly ten years, bear witness against them. (Loud cheers.) Well, they sent a deputation to America, and Dr Cunningham was one of them. Did they bear with them a faithful deliverance on the subject of slavery? (Hear, hear.) Did they tell the people of the Southern States what they thought of slavery, and then leave them to give, or withhold, as they pleased? Did they say, "We are the very men who have been denouncing you for ten years, and not you only, but all who have visited your shores without lifting up a voice against slavery?" Did they say, "We are the men who have invited George Thompson to lecture in our pulpits, and have praised him in our papers, and our magazines, for his fearless exposure of your sanctified villanies?" Did they do or say these things? No; they did not. They landed—they thrust aside a calm and Christian admonition to abstain from fraternizing the manstealers of America—they consented to seal their lips upon the subject of slavery; and they at once rushed to the arms of the men whom they had for ten years overwhelmed with the fiercest anathemas. They passed unheeding through the field where the lash of the driver fell on the sun-blistered back of helpless woman, and entered the house of the slaveholder. They sat in a General Assembly in which they saw the question of slavery introduced only to be scouted

as unworthy of notice. They stood up in that Assembly — amidst the clanking chains of three millions of slaves, denied the right of looking into the word of God, and doomed to a state of universal concubinage, and worse than Cimmerian darkness—and there, in that Assembly, they asked sympathy with free, sun-lighted, Sabbath-blessed, Bible-reading, church-going Scotland, and were dumb on the subject of the abomination of desolation perpetuated by the clerical slaveholders to whom they addressed themselves. (Immense cheering.) Tell me, Free Church people of Scotland, were you represented and honoured, or were you betrayed, in the hour when a deputation, using your name and acting on your behalf, thus sold themselves and you for the dollars that had been wrung from the enslaved, the imbruted, the unmanned, and soul-withered victims—upon whom those delegates cast no eye of pity, for whom they had no word of comfort, and to whose callous and conscience-seared masters they addressed not a syllable of warning or rebuke? (Cheers.) Whispers of their doings reached this country, and certain vigilant friends of the slave in Glasgow (all honour to them!) sounded the note of alarm, and said—"Beware lest the treasury of the Free Church is polluted by the price of blood." 'Twas vain! Money came over from the Southern States, and instead of being rejected, it was announced with a flourish of trumpets, as the first fruits of a rich harvest from the Transatlantic churches. I must hasten on. The delegates returned, and it was my misfortune to listen to one of that delegation, Dr Burns (then of Paisley), who—no longer the consistent champion of freedom—had to make the best apology he could for the course that had been taken by his brethren. This was in 1844. It was then earnestly hoped that, awakened to a sense of the sin that had been committed, the Free Church would send back the money. Instead of this, however, and for the purpose of quieting the consciences and scruples of the people, Dr Candlish prepared and brought forward a report on slavery. And now I beg you to mark the progress of events; for we are about to make a disclosure, which, if there be any hatred of deception in the minds of the people of this country, will excite universal contempt. A report, I say, was brought forward in the Assembly of 1844, and was unanimously adopted. Let me draw your attention to a passage or two in this report, and beg you to mark particularly the manner in which American slavery and slaveholding churches are spoken of. This is important, as you will presently perceive. The report says:—

"1. As to the subject of these overtures, the institution of slavery itself, and the continuance or toleration of it in the bosom of a professedly Christian community, the committee are assured that but one feeling prevails among all the members of this church. In its own nature, slavery in all its forms is to be regarded as *a system of oppression* which cannot be defended. Natural reason, sound policy, a sense of justice between man and man, as well as the whole tenor and spirit of the divine word, and especially of the dispensations of the gospel, concur in condemning it; and it is the glory of Christianity, that hitherto, in proportion to its advancing and prevailing influence, slavery has been mitigated, relaxed, discontinued, and finally extirpated and abolished. It is therefore with the deepest pain that every rightly constituted Christian mind must contemplate the continued and tolerated existence of slavery in the United States of America; and, apart from the feelings which cannot but be called forth by the mere fact of this practice of slavery being allowed, in a country making her just boast of the maintenance of equal liberties and equal rights, there are aggravations apparently in the American usage, particularly in the provisions made for the keeping up of the supply of slaves, in the obstacles interposed to their moral and religious education, and in the laws applicable to the protection of

the rights of masters, which must characterise American slavery as one of the most deplorable forms of *that evil*, peculiarly calling for the exertions of a sound Christian philanthropy in regard to it. 2. While these are the sentiments which, as the committee are assured, universally prevail in this church in reference to the institution in question, it is right that it should be borne in mind that the responsibility of it cannot be regarded as lying exclusively at the door of the American States, but *must to a large extent be shared by our own country*. The recollection of our own colonial slavery, with its African slave trade, is too recent; and the facts which connect American slavery in some of its worst features, with British customs and laws, in use before these States became independent, are too palpable to admit of anything like self-complacency in such a case as the present. At the same time, while *taking to this country its full share of blame in the matter*, it is not unreasonable to point to the better example which it has at last been enabled to set, and the encouragement which the success attending it holds out to other free countries to follow the example. 3. Holding these views respecting the system of slavery in itself, and as it is said to prevail in America, the committee cannot but consider it the duty of Christian churches, as such, to set themselves against its manifold abuses, and to aim decidedly at its abolition; nor can they conceive of Christian churches giving their sanction to this institution, without a painful apprehension of the responsibility which they must in that case incur in reference to the laws which regulate it, and the calamities which flow from it. While expressing generally this conviction, the committee at the same time feel, that it is *not for this church to decide peremptorily* what ought to be regarded as the particular course of duty to be immediately and universally adopted in the circumstances in which the American churches are placed. As yet, this church is in possession of far too scanty information, and has had by far too little communication with the American churches on the subject, to be able, or to be entitled, to pronounce upon the details of what must be admitted to be *a difficult practical question*."

The entire tone and spirit of the report are in keeping with this extract. I think you will admit that it was scarcely possible to write on the subject, and say anything less severe or less offensive. All is gentleness, allowance, and diffidence. In fact, there is as much o apology as reproof in this document, and the Assembly even volunteers to take a large share of the responsibility, and appropriate it in this country. Such was the report of 1844. It did not, however, extinguish the agitation of the question. The money still remained in the coffers of the Sustentation Fund, and the people wisely judged, that no blessing could accompany a remonstrance against slavery, however faithful, while the profits of the system remained in the hands of the remonstrants. They therefore said, "Be consistent; give the best of all proofs—the only genuine proof—of your hatred of slavery, by sending back the unhallowed fruits of the system, which in an evil day you have permitted to come into your sanctuary." This was the cry, until the Assembly of 1845 met. In the meantime it was judged expedient by the leaders of the Free Church that something more should be done, especially as some stir had been made in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and the Moderator himself had asked the startling question:—"Have we separated from our moderate brethren to form alliance with manstealers?" In these circumstances, another report was drawn up, bearing the most indubitable marks of its paternity. It was presented on the 2d of June 1845, and unanimously adopted. Let me now draw your attention to this document, that you may contrast its tone and language with the first. I have already freely expressed my opinion respecting it; and have exposed its sophistry and radical unsoundness. I only allude to it now, that you may understand the nature of the imposition (for I can

call it by no milder name) which has been practised upon the Free Church of Scotland and the people of this country generally. Keeping in mind the terms of the former report, listen to the language of this, and contrast the two in your own minds. Slavery is now spoken of in the following way: —

"There is no question here as to the *heinous sin* involved in the institution of American slavery; nor can there be any terms too strong to be employed in pointing out the *national guilt* which attaches to the continuance of that *accursed system*, and the *national judgments* which, under the government of a righteous God, may be expected to mark the *Divine displeasure* against it. Neither can there be any doubt as to the duty incumbent upon all American Christians to exert themselves to the utmost, in every competent way, for the purpose of having it abolished. The only difference of opinion that can exist among the members of this church respects the duty of the churches in America, as churches, who are called to deal partially with the evils of slavery, when it forms part of the social system in the community in which they are placed. Even as to this matter, it is believed that the difference is more apparent than real. Without being prepared to adopt the principle, that, in the circumstances in which they are placed, the churches in America ought to consider slaveholding as *per se* an insuperable barrier in the way of enjoying Christian privileges, or an offence to be visited with excommunication, all must agree in holding, that whatever rights the civil law of the land may give a master over his slaves, as *chattels personal*, it cannot but be *sin of the deepest dye* in him to regard or to treat them as such; and whosoever commits that sin in any sense, or deals otherwise with his slaves than as a Christian man ought to deal with his fellow-men, whatever power the law may give him over them, ought to be held disqualified for Christian communion. Farther, it must be the opinion of all, that it is the duty of Christians, when they find themselves, unhappily, in the predicament of slaveholders, to aim, as far as it may be practicable, at the manumission o their slaves; and, where that cannot be accomplished, to secure them in the enjoyment of the domestic relations, and of the means of religious training and education. And all conduct of a contrary tendency, if persevered in, ought to be visited with the *highest ecclesiastical censure*, in every church of Christ."

Here we have the words "heinous sin," "accursed system," "national judgments," "Divine displeasure," and the "highest ecclesiastical censure," spoken of. We have also the right of property, when claimed and exercised to the injury of the slave, described as "a sin of the deepest dye." We have, too, an explicit statement of what the General Assembly conceives to be the duty of the master, and also the duty of the church, on this important question. This deliverance, though it does not strike at the root of the iniquity, by declaring the relation, under all circumstances, *sinful*, is a decided improvement on the former one. The ground is narrowed; slavery is more accurately described; and there is much more room for exercising discipline under this, than under the previous report. Well, no sooner was this out, than the shout was raised, "Surely this will satisfy those who call upon us to deal faithfully with our brethren in America. What church has ever before said anything like this? We are the first among all the churches to come out and speak of slavery in this way." I need not attempt to prove to you that this deliverance has been held up by every Free Church organ, by every pamphleteer, and by every tractarian, as a model of plain dealing and fearless rebuke. "Wait," has been the language, "and see how this deliverance is received." The people of the Free Church thought it was in America ten or eleven months ago. I thought it was there, and spoke of it as there, and ventured to predict the manner in which its doctrines and denuncia-

tions would be regarded. Now for the facts of the case. To the utter astonishment of all but the select few who are permitted to share in the councils and plans of Dr Candlish, that gentleman rose on Saturday, and informed his reverend fathers and brethren that that report had never been sent. (Great sensation, and cries of "Shame," mingled with hisses.) Hear what he says—I quote from the *Witness*:—

"The Assembly are *aware* that the Assembly of 1845 also approved of a report upon this subject. I am not *aware* that that report, approved of by the Assembly of 1845, *has yet been transmitted* to the Presbyterian Church of America. I do not know that it was the mind of the Assembly that it should be transmitted. It was simply a report relative to the principles on which we should conduct our intercourse with that church. *It was nothing more.* It was rather a report for *our own guidance* than to be communicated to other parties—it was a report to bring out the principles which it appeared to the Assembly of 1845 ought to regulate our intercourse with churches situated like the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America."

Mark, I beseech you, the frankness and blunt honesty of Dr Candlish. The Assembly was "*aware*" that the report was adopted. To be sure they were, and thought it had been for a year among the churches of America. Poor deluded mortals! The Free Church papers of Scotland and Ireland were "*aware*," and they, too, quoted it as a document doing at the time its salutary work in America. All the country was "*aware*," and were commending or censuring it, according as they approved or disapproved its principles and its doctrines. The Anti-Slavery Committee in London were "*aware*," and took the trouble to write a protest against its shortcomings, in order to furnish an antidote to the mischief it might do in America. Poor hoodwinked mortals, all

"Led by the nose as asses are."

"I am not *aware*," says the Doctor, "that that report has yet been transmitted" That is to say (but the Doctor has a way of his own), I know it has never been sent. I took good care of that. You, good easy souls, went home to tell your wives and congregations what great things you had done in the way of reproving your erring brothers across the water; and while you were dreaming of their sorrow, their repentance, and their reformation—or of their displeasure, their obstinacy, and their indignation—the report was quietly slumbering in my desk, never having smelt the sea air, or taken the first step towards the land of those whom you intended it should be the instrument of saving from sin, from guilt, and from danger. "It was only a report for our own guidance; nothing more." How cool—how refreshing! At the end of twelve months, Dr Candlish tells his wondering fellows, that their solemn deliverance on slavery was only for their own guidance. They are told what slavery is, and of "national judgments" and "Divine displeasure," and how they should deal with slaveholders, and upon whom they should inflict censure. These good country ministers—preaching to the farmers, and women, and hinds of Scotland, are told these things for their "guidance;" as they are likely to have difficult cases of slaveholding coming before their sessions and presbyteries; or, to use the language of the report, that they may know how to regulate their intercourse with America. Be it so. The report of 1844 went out full of sweet words and offers of affection; then comes this private report for the guidance of the Assembly; and then, when another report goes to America, and the brethren ask, "Whence comes this change in your tone?" Dr Candlish will turn round and say, "Oh, in 1845, we adopted a report for our own guidance; but deemed it as well, or better, not to let you know anything about it." People of Scotland, are your eyes open yet? If not, wait but

a while, and, if I do not much mistake, you will soon witness many more things of the same sort. Take one more specimen. We were told on Saturday, that an answer had been received from America to the report of 1844; that it was received twelve months ago; addressed to the Rev. Henry Grey, and through him to the Assembly. Did it reach the Assembly, whose property it exclusively was? No. It reached Dr Candlish, and has got no further. (Hear, hear.) It has to be replied to, but the Assembly are to have no part in that matter. The letter from America is never read. Dr Candlish utters some obscure hints about it not being just what it ought to be. He then condescends to impart a hint or two, as to the answer he is thinking of returning; but he must have time to prepare it, because "it *plainly* must be done with *a little circumlocution*." (Loud laughter.) Yes, these are his words—a *leetle* circumlocution; and "therefore it will take some pains." And this is the freedom of the members of the *Free* Church of Scotland! They are cajoled in regard to the deliverance of 1845—they are not allowed to see the letter from America in reply to their report of 1844, and are told to leave the answer in the hands of Dr Candlish, that he may take pains to do it with a little circumlocution. (Cheers.) I should like to see a slaveholding minister in America, when he is reading this part of the Doctor's speech—telling him to prepare for a "little circumlocution," and the "*usual phraseology* of friendly intercourse." What was the result of all that was said in the Assembly on Saturday? A vote, or rather a silent agreement, to leave the whole matter in the hands of Drs Candlish and Cunningham. The slavery of three millions of human beings—the character and duty of the American churches—the honour, consistency, and purity of the Free Church of Scotland—the nature and requirements of the law of God—and the spirit and precepts of the gospel—these were the questions involved; and Drs Cunningham and Candlish having spoken, and poured their indignation upon us, and their ridicule on Mr Macbeth, the venerable Assembly said *Amen* to the doctrines of their leaders; but found not a word to say in behalf of their libelled Christianity, or the claims of God's poor and suffering children. Alas for the bondmen of America!

> "Yet, yet, degraded men! the expected day
> That breaks your bitter cup, is far away;
> Trade, wealth, and fashion, ask you still to bleed,
> And holy men *give Scripture for the deed*."

Time will not permit me, to-night, to do more than very briefly and cursorily notice one or two points in Saturday's proceedings. We are told by Dr Candlish that the venerable Clarkson was opposed to us, and that Dr Andrew Thomson, if living, would have been. Mr Macbeth came to the rescue of Clarkson, by saying that he had received a letter from him, fully approving of the pamphlet which he (Mr Macbeth) had written, to show the guilt of the connection subsisting between the Free Church and slavery. (Cheers.) In justice to the late Andrew Thomson, and to show the estimation in which he held such theologians as the present rulers in the Free Church, I will read a portion of a note, appended to one of his sermons—a sermon entitled "Slavery not *sanctioned* but *condemned* by Christianity." (Cheers.) I can fancy he had certain incipient doctors in his mind's eye, when he penned the following words:—

> "In maintaining the propriety and justice of such a measure, *I will not enter the lists with men who, professing to be more enlightened than their fellows on all points of theology*, and dogmatising with more than the confidence of apostles, can bravely defend slavery as a right thing—not to be condemned and abolished—but rather to be *tolerated, countenanced, continued*—merely because they are pleased to call it a type of the subjection which is due to Christ from his people, and as a great ordinance of God for preaching that subjection to the

church. I will not argue with men, however eloquent and however good, who will palm upon me such an absurd and unscriptural *dictum*, and because I refuse to take it as gospel, on authority no better than human, will denounce me as one of those who are "in a state of profound ignorance and rebellious feeling." I will not argue with men who can gravely and dictatorially speak of a slaveholder as "the standing type over all the world of Christ, the Lord both of the election and the reprobation," and of the poor slaves as standing types over all the world of the reprobation, while those who serve the same master but are free, are standing types of the election. I will not, I cannot argue with men who can indulge in such raving; and not only demand a hearing for it as if it were sober sense, but insist upon our unreserved adoption of it, under the penalty of being found utterly unacquainted with the Bible, and guilty of joining in insurrection against God. *Rather than argue with such men*, I would encounter the most *bigotted slave-driver in the West Indies*, who founds not his creed upon his own infallible interpretation of the infallible oracles of Divine mercy, but upon views which faith in these oracles may at once and altogether subvert, or which may undergo a beneficial change by deeper consideration and more lengthened experience. With neither class, however, would I be very willing to engage in dispute, seeing that with neither would it be easy to agree in any common ground where we might stand and reason; or, rather, seeing that they and I differ *toto cælo* as to the essential nature and demerit of slavery. *I am to be understood as proceeding on the principle* contended for in the discourse to which this note is affixed; namely, *that slavery is condemned by religion, or, in other words, is immoral; and upon that principle I plead for the immediate and total abolition of slavery.*"

(Loud cheers.) I cannot resist an impulse to read to you the following observations of Mr Clarkson on a pamphlet by Dr Chalmers, entitled, *A Few Thoughts on the Abolition of Colonial Slavery*, published in 1826:—

"PLAYFORD HALL, 24th April 1826.—Objectionable as his (Dr Chalmers's) recommendations are, his name and character might have procured attention to them from the world. I am myself personally acquainted with Dr Chalmers, and have always esteemed his talents and reputation, and indeed have looked upon him as an extraordinary man, whose penetration could dive deep into intricate subjects, and whose fixed principles of religion would insure a virtuous result. Hence it is with *entire astonishment* that I have read his plan, as developed by you in the two Glasgow newspapers now in my hands. How he could suffer himself to be talked over, or his *good sense to be imposed upon*, by his friend, the planter, I am at a loss to conceive, but *still more am I surprised*, still more am I at a loss to imagine, how he, a professor of morality, and esteemed as a just man throughout the kingdom, should, when compensation was suggested to his mind, have thought of applying it to the *master* only, and *have wholly forgotten the slave*. When good men think of compensation, at least such as I know, they usually think of the *slave*, and nothing of the master. For what, they would say, are you to compensate him for? Are you to compensate him for the crimes committed unblushingly against a portion of his innocent fellow-creatures for years? for tyranny and bloodshed, &c., &c.? Let it not be forgotten that these very men, the planters, to whom the compensation is to be made, according to Dr Chalmers, would, had they lived in the time of Moses, and under the Jewish theocracy, have been put to death. Not only was the manstealer to suffer, *but he in whose hands the stolen man was found*,—the receiver of the stolen goods; which is precisely the situation in which our planters stand, according to an unbiassed morality, notwithstanding that the British Parliament authorised the slave trade; for the British Parliament *had no more right* to give Englishmen

leave to plunder the coast of Africa of its inhabitants, than the French legislature have to give to Frenchmen permission to go to trade for human bodies on the coast of Cornwall or Devonshire, or on the banks of your river, the Clyde." I have reason to know that Mr Clarkson does not feel less abhorrence for the manstealers of America than he did twenty years ago for the manstealers of the West Indies. If Dr Candlish differs from me, let him write to Mr Clarkson and learn his mind. (Cheers.) "The slaveholders of primitive times were admitted by the apostles to the table of the Lord, and to all the privileges and ordinances of the Christian religion." This is the *dictum* of the learned professor who fills the theological chair in the Free Church college, and to whom Scotland looks for future ministers of the gospel! Slaveholders, therefore, may be good Christians! Certainly, says Dr Cunningham, for Philemon was a slaveholder, and the dear friend of the apostle Paul. You have but to preach this doctrine, Dr C., and as fast as you lose Scotch students, I may promise you that the planters of America will send their sons to supply their places. I will not stay to combat his assertion; but admitting that there were slaveholders in the Christian churches, how will Dr Cunningham reconcile the fact, that Christianity swept slavery from the face of western Europe, with the fact that slavery in America has grown up under the shadow and sanction of Christianity, and now leans upon it for its chief support? How comes it that in the one case it extirpated slavery, and in the other has sanctioned and supported it? I will answer that question. In the one case, Christianity was preached and applied by Paul and his successors; and, in the other, has been perverted, and then preached by such theologians as Dr Cunningham. (Loud cheers.) Let the Christianity Dr Cunningham preaches prevail, and the crack of the slave-whip and the rattle of the chain will be heard till the archangel's trump shall sound. A word about the money-taking business. "We do right," say the learned doctors, "to take the money of slaveholders;" "and we mean to keep it," says Mr Begg. Well, let us see what your predecessors in the ministry used to do. Let us turn to a book called the APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS—(book iv., chap. 6.) What do we read:

"It behoves a bishop to know *whose gifts* he ought to *receive*, and whose he ought not. Hucksters who bring a gift are to be shunned. Whoremongers are to be avoided, robbers and covetous persons and adulterers; for the sacrifices of such are abominable to the Lord. But also those who afflict the widow, and oppress the orphan, and fill the prisons with the innocent; *as well as those who use their own domestics badly*, whether by whipping or starving, or hard service; those also who lay waste cities. Let such be shunned by thee, O bishop, *their offerings are polluted*."

I think it would be very hard to prove, in the face of a law like this, that a bishop might take money from such a man as an American slaveholder. (Cheers.) Now, if the Free Church leaders have any respect for apostolical laws and constitutions, they will, when they read this passage, confess that they have polluted the treasury of the Lord, and lose no time in sending back the money. (Great cheering.) Again, I find Cyprian, the Bishop of Alexandria, making a collection in his church, and sending a deputation to another Christian church in the metropolis of North Africa to collect money there, for the purpose of ransoming from bondage a large number of Numidian captives; and I can scarcely suppose that while he was doing this he was sitting down with slaveholders at the Lord's table. (Cheers.) I think you will agree with me that the Scottish deputation went upon a very different mission, and acted in a very different manner. They left the slave unheeded in his bonds, his ignorance, and his blood, and took the money of his tyrant master to instruct the poor benighted heathen of Scotland. (Loud cheers.) I find, however, that the Free Church has been sometimes

rather particular, and have not acted upon the advice of the *Dundee Warder*, to take money from all quarters, asking no questions for conscience sake. (Laughter.) If I am not mistaken, they were once offered a portion of the proceeds of *a ball* towards the support of their Gaelic schools, and refused it, choosing rather that the heads of the Highlanders should go unfurnished, than that they should be instructed by means so improperly raised. (Laughter and cheers.) This was indeed high-toned morality. To get money by dancing was *wrong*; but to take it from slaveholders was right. Dancing is a profane practice; but slaveholding—why, that is a very primitive and apostolical practice, and we should be wise above what is written, if we were to refuse it—nay, we should do wrong if we did not send to ask it. Once more: if I mistake not, Dr Candlish himself has, in times past, been a great stickler for non-communion. I think he has gone farther than any modern abolitionist would go. I think he once said to those who were learning from his lips—"Better abstain from going to church altogether when you have no *Free Church* to attend." (Cheers and laughter.) I should not be surprised were this lesson to be practised in another way, especially if Dr Candlish and his colleagues should continue to preach such doctrines as they recently held forth at Cannonmills Hall. (Cheers.) Let him beware, or the people may begin to say with the poet:—

Woe to the Priesthood—woe
To those whose hire is with the price of blood—
Perverting, darkening, changing as they go
The searching truths of God!
Who turn
Judgment aside, and rob the Holy Book
Of those high words of truth which search and burn
In warning and rebuke!—(Cheers.)

One word more before we part. Be prepared for another juggle—for some new move upon the chess-board—for some deep-planned expedient, to avert the just demand of a people, whose moral and religious sense has been outraged by the confederacy into which certain persons have entered with the enslavers of God's children. Learn wisdom from the struggles and triumphs which you have witnessed around you. Don't give up your battle cry—"Send back the money." Don't compromise the principle—"No union with slaveholders." Don't be diverted from the steady pursuit of your object. Let no "red herring" lead you astray. If they talk of difficulties, leave those to get out of them who, with their eyes open, got into them. If they talk of danger, talk you of the danger of doing wrong; of being found in the company of slaveholders; and say resolutely that if they will not rid you of such company, you must rid yourselves, and leave them alone with the companions they have chosen, and are resolved to retain. Oh, I conjure you, by whatever is sacred, and moving, and pitiful, forsake this unholy alliance, and cast in your lot with the perishing slave! I would entreat you, in the name of three millions of darkened and degraded outcasts from the family of man—by the blackness and horrors of that heathenism into which slavery has plunged these helpless victims of avarice and lust of dominion—by the blood of a martyred Lovejoy, and the cold corpse of a beloved Torrey—by the tears of mourning widows and fatherless children—by your jealousy for the character and usefulness of Scotland's Free but erring Church—by the majesty of that Divine law, which slavery seeks to trample in the dust—and by the blessings of that gospel, which slavery intercepts between heaven and the souls of men—gird on the armour for this fight, stand firm, quit yourselves like men. Fling away the already cast-off dogmas of the worst pro-slavery men in America. Don't let them find a last hiding place in Scotland. Receive into your souls the heaven-born and world-saving truths of God's word, and give them fair play. You will then be proof against the

miserable slavery-supporting logic of those who would mislead you. Above all, identify yourself with the slave. See with his eyes, hear with his ears; if it is possible, get into his heart, and realise his emotions. Remember he is your brother, and the man who would enslave him would enslave you—

Children are we all
Of one great Father, in whatever clime
His Providence hath cast the seed of life;
All tongues, all colours—neither after death
Shall we be sorted into languages
And tints—white, black, and tawny, Greek and Goth,
Northmen, and offspring of hot Africa;
The all-seeing Father—He in whom we live and move,
He, the indifferent judge of all—regards
Nations and hues and dialects alike;
According to their works shall they be judged,
When even-handed justice in the scale
Their good and evil weighs.—(Great applause.)

I have done. This vast assembly is a proof of the growing interest in this question; your own applause is proof of the sympathy you feel with those who address you; and your known earnestness in the prosecution of every cause in which you heartily embark, is the pledge that in this cause you will never draw back, until, in union with the wise, the good, the free throughout your land, you have constrained the recipients of the wages of unrighteousness to

SEND BACK THE MONEY!

(Mr Thompson sat down amidst long-continued much plause.)

...bers ...selves may be willing to make full compensation should their leaders consent to send back the money; and it is probable that many of their adherents will forsake them if they do not send it back, and that their popularity will suffer among the multitudes who have been till now wandering after them. The mere sending back, therefore, would not amount to an acknowledgment that it is an accursed thing—the price of blood—a mark of fellowship with the workers of iniquity. "I rejoice not that ye were made sorry, but that your sorrow produced reformation—what carefulness it wrought in you—yea, what clearing of yourselves—what indignation—what fear—what earnest desire—what zeal and revenge—so that you have proved yourselves to be clear in this matter." It is alleged by Messrs Thompson, Douglass, &c., that the American slaveholders are persecutors of the Lord Jesus in the persons of His little ones; and it is certain that He will say—"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Now, for thirty pieces of silver, Judas sold Him whom he called Lord and Master; but when he saw the consequence, even *he gave back the money*. He did more. He gave it back unsolicited; he gave it back with this just confession —"*I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood.*" His sorrow for what he had done was greater than he could bear; and though not of a godly sort, he could not keep the reward of iniquity, which was applied to purchase the field of blood. They that desire to be rich, fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful desires, which plunge men into destruction and perdition; for the love of money is the root of all evil, which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things, and follow after righteousness.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

G. L.

Kirkcaldy, May 1846.

THE FREE CHURCH

AND

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

HOW DOES THE FREE CHURCH REGARD AND TREAT AMERICAN SLAVES?

THIS QUESTION IS ANSWERED IN THE FOLLOWING LETTER OF

GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ. TO HENRY C. WRIGHT.

It is but justice to the writer to say, that the Letter was written in the freedom of private friendship, and is published without his knowledge. It is a true and terrible picture of what is done by all who join in Christian fellowship with Manstealers:—

London, May 7, 1846.

My dear Henry,—Yours of Tuesday, from Edinburgh, is before me; the pamphlet also. The latter leaves the question where it finds it. As far as it touches *that*, it is but a repetition of the stale libels cast upon our holy and blessed Christianity by those who go to the Old and New Testaments for their warrant to invade, sacrilegiously, God's family, and run away with a part of his offspring.

O, What a God must the God of those be, who represent him, virtually, as saying, "You must not enslave my *white* children, for I made them 'free and equal;' but I have some poor black curly-headed ones, and, as I don't much care about them, you may help yourselves, and do as you please with them. True, I have embraced even them in the covenant of my grace and mercy, and they shall be *mine* (if they believe the gospel) in the day when I make up my jewels. This is enough—*eternity is theirs;* they are yours till time shall be no longer. My Word, preached by prophets and apostles and patriarchs, is for *you*, and for the Chinese, the Hindoos, the Mussulmen, for all the *straight-haired* races; but as for these, having 'searched the Scriptures' for *yourselves*, you may deny to them the power of looking into the 'will' of their Heavenly Father, and tell them no more than suits your convenience. THEY MAY READ IT WHEN THEY GET TO HEAVEN. You may point them to mansions on high—you may tell them that they shall 'walk' with their Saviour in 'white'—you may promise them a crown of life, and lift their hopes to a crown of glory, where they shall be 'kings and priests,' and tread the city of the saved in robes of light; but *here*, you may make and keep them *slaves*. Their names are written in the *Lamb's book*, but you need not strike them out of your *ledger*. Their bodies are the 'temple of the Holy Ghost;' but the 'temple,' if not the tenant, is yours, to do with as you please. I stand at the door and knock, and if any one opens, I enter and 'abide there.' But never mind *me*. The house is yours, you have a life-lease, though the guest is the Son of God. Tell them they may lay up 'treasure *in heaven;*' but all they *have* and *are*, are yours, *on earth*. Tell them that Christ hath said, 'If any do the will of his Father in heaven, the same are his *mother* and his *sister* and his *brother;* but that Christ has no objection to his *mother* his *brother* or his *sister* being a slave. Tell them, that in their origin, their destiny, and their faculties, (to be *hereafter* unfolded,) they are but 'a little lower than the angels,' but that, for the present, you may make them a little lower than the beasts. Tell them that they were redeemed out of spiritual bondage by 'the precious blood of the Son of God,' but that you may sell them into temporal bondage for such corruptible things as silver and gold."

But whither am I running? My paper rebukes my rhapsody. My thoughts were with the slave on earth, and with the free man in heaven—running up and down Jacob's ladder, from the plantation on earth to the New Jerusalem in glory—from the horrible bondage of the slave below to the glorious liberty of the Son of God above. Forgive me! I had anticipated the day—"the day for which all other days were made"—when Christ shall know his own—when the Shepherd shall claim his sheep;—the day when that temple shall be built in heaven, the stones whereof have been fashioned by the Divine Architect on earth. In that fold *I see the negro;* in that temple I see the negro—a living stone. Outside of that fold, and excluded from the materials of that temple, methinks I see those who claimed the child of God as *theirs*. What would they now give to recognise him—to be recognised by him? Methinks I hear them say, "Have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works?" and the answer is, "I never knew ye; I was on earth, but ye bought and sold me—ye manacled and scourged me—ye outlawed and enslaved me—ye despised and insulted me; I came to ye in the form of *a black man:* I was poor, ignorant, friendless, powerless—*as a black man;* and, while ye professed to worship me, seated at the right-hand of my Father, in majesty and glory, ye spurned me from the door—ye drove me to the field, and hunted me with dogs: I came to ye as a little child, and in the helplessness of infancy asked ye to succour me, and train me for heaven; ye ranked me with the calves of your stall—fed me only for the flesh market—and sold me on the shambles."

No more. The ground is holy. The thought is overpowering—I have done. The more I think on this subject, the more I find the incompetency of words to express my thoughts. O, God, forgive my sins, and save me from this—the most terrible of all—that of persecuting thee in the person of thy children! For better, for worse, I link myself with thy suffering poor, and glory in the name of "Infidel," if thy vicegerent in my heart tells me that I BELIEVE IN THEE, when I believe that it is not thy will that one of these little ones should perish. Appear for their deliverance; make those strong who plead their cause. Be with thy servant when they go in unto Pharaoh, and cry "let my people go." May they be confounded in the presence of the great congregation, who pervert thy law, and make void thy statutes; and may the prey be delivered out of the hands of the spoiler!

I scribble this in the Club Room, and send it to assure you that my heart is with you. Be no longer from Edinburgh than you can help. All arrangements for the Assembly week should be soon made, and *well* made.—Yours and the slaves,

GEORGE THOMPSON.

Henry C. Wright.

A LETTER FROM HENRY C. WRIGHT,

TO

MINISTERS AND MEMBERS

OF THE

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

FRIENDS,

IT is known to you that every American slaveholder is a MANSTEALER. No man can hold a slave in America and not hold him as a "CHATTEL PERSONAL to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." This you know, for you have been told it by witnesses whose veracity you do not doubt, *i.e.* by the slave laws, and by the decisions of civil and ecclesiastical courts. You know that no man can acquire a moral right to hold the "*persons*" of men as property. You know, too, that God has classed "MANSTEALERS" with "MURDERERS OF FATHERS AND MURDERERS OF MOTHERS."

You have joined hands with MANSTEALERS, and are under a *publicly* expressed pledge to receive them to your pulpits and communion as Christians and Christian ministers. You solicited money of them as of Christians to build your churches, and they gave the money with the understanding that you were to recognise them as Christians; for had they known that you rejected their claim to Christianity, on the ground of their holding and using men as their property, they never would have given you a farthing. This you knew when you received their money. You have BETRAYED CHRIST—SOLD YOUR SAVIOUR—BARTERED HIM WHO IS GOD OVER ALL, BLESSED FOR EVER—for £3000—by consenting to make Him the confederate of slave-breeders and slave-traders; and you are now attempting to convince the people of Scotland that these "sinners of the first rank" are engrafted into Christ as living, fruitful branches of the true vine!!

To justify yourselves in this confederacy with manstealers, you say *you have entered into it for* THEIR *good*, and that you are induced to persevere in it for the purpose of showing them their guilt, and of bringing them to repentance. The plea is specious, but most impious and fallacious. This is not the way you treat other thieves. Do you admit horse-stealers to your communion and pulpits, as Christians and Christian ministers, in order to bring them to repentance? When you hear of a community of sheep-stealers calling themselves Christians, do you send your Cunninghams and Lewises to them as your deputations, and form an alliance with them, engaging to receive them as Christians, in order to reform them? You do not.

Why, then, did you send your Cunningham and Lewis 3000 miles, to form an alliance with those whom you had formerly been accustomed to regard as manstealers, and then, on their return with £3000, received as pay for your countenance, seek to justify yourselves, by saying —*you did it all* for their good? You engaged to admit them to your pulpits and communion "as honoured, respectable, useful, evangelical churches and ministers of Christ," [Rev. Dr. Cunningham's speech before the Presbytery of Edinburgh] in order to persuade them to quit stealing men! You now wrap the bright robe of Christ's righteousness around men whom, before you left the Established Church, you were accustomed to denounce as the worst of thieves! What has made those Carolina and Mobile manstealers seem so lovely in your eyes, since you

left the Establishment? How is it that since you called yourselves the "FREE Church of Scotland"—those very slave drivers whom you denounced as the worst sinners, while you were in what you call your "ERASTIAN BONDAGE," have become your companions in the pulpit, and at the communion table of our Lord? You know their character is unchanged. They are still MAN-STEALERS—and continue to breed, buy, and hold slaves. You say it is all for their good!! So slave-holders steal men for their good, and then you embrace the manstealers as Christians, for *their good?* Did Christ and the Apostles thus receive thieves, adulterers, drunkards, and extortioners, to the fellowship of saints, as the new-born children of adoption, in order to induce them to forsake their sins?"

Again—*You seek to justify your confederacy with man stealers by charging Abolitionists with errors on other subjects.* What are your charges? Henry C. Wright and Wm. Lloyd Garrison deny that the first day Sabbath, is of divine appointment; that the Old Testament is of any authority against the positive commands of the New; and that war is ever right. Because we hold these opinions, you insist on—what? *Not* that our charges against you are false; for you yourselves admit that American slave-holders are man-stealers; that you are pledged to receive them to your pulpits and communion, and that you shared their plunder, with the understanding on their part, that they were thus to be received by you; *but*, that you are *justified* in this alliance.

Whether my views of the Sabbath, of War, and the authority of Moses, when quoted to overthrow the authority of Christ, be right or wrong, I shall not stop to argue now. Nor do I ask you to recognise me as a *Christian.* Set me down as a Jew, a Mahometan, a Heathen, or Infidel, if you can find it in your hearts to do so. I ask, How does this prove that your league with slave-breeders is right?

Your argument is this—Henry C. Wright denies that the first day is any more holy than any other day, therefore it is right for us to form a Christian alliance with Man-stealers! He is a *Non-Resistant;* therefore the Free Church will welcome Slave-breeders to her pulpits and communion. H. C. Wright is not a Christian; therefore Man-stealers *are* Christians, and it is right that the Free Church should welcome them, as such, to her loving embrace. H. C. Wright is not the man to instruct the Nixons, the Lewises, the M'Naughtans, the Chalmerses, Cunninghams, Candlishes; the *Warders, Witnesses, Watches,* and *Guardians* of the Free Church in Christian morals; therefore we will go to Man-stealers for instruction. "The abolitionists are wholly destitute of judgment, sense, or sanity;" therefore the Free Church is justified in drawing closer the bonds of Christian fellowship with "renouncers of Marriage-rights—with Man-stealers—with adulterers—with men polluted with incest—stained with the blood of innocents—leprous with sin."—(Henry Grey.) Such is your plea. Will it stand in the court of Heaven?

Friends, I believe that Christ is "GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH." He is my only "Lawgiver, Judge, and King." Around that Being cluster all that is dearest to me on Earth, and all my hopes for Eternity. Whatever you may think or say of me, you will admit that I have too much regard for the honour of my Redeemer, to associate His name with MAN-STEALERS. This you are labouring to do. In the name of God, I charge you to cease to promote this alliance. In the deliverances of your General Assembly—in the speeches of your Cunninghams, and

Candlishes; your Lewises, your Nixons, your M'Naughtans, and your Roxburghs; in the letter of your Chalmers; in your *Witnesses*, *Warders*, *Guardians*, and *Watches*, you have sought to justify yourselves in associating the name of Christian and of Christ with Man-stealers. Say what you can find it your duty to say of me and of my coadjutors in the holy cause of Abolition, only follow the example of your SECESSION and RELIEF brethren, and adopt the principle—that *no slaveholder shall be admitted to your pulpits and communion*—and I will bless you in the name of my God and of His three millions of enslaved children.

AGAIN—You seek to justify your copartnership with manstealers, by asserting that *others before you have shared in their spoils.* You refer to the Rose Street Secession Church—to the Argyll Square Chapel—to the Congregationalists—to the Baptists and Methodists—to Cotton and Sugar Merchants—to Missionary Societies—and to all who use the products of slave labour. These, you say, received money of slaveholders, to carry out their plans.

Admitting the facts to be as you assert—Because others have done wrong, does that justify you in doing wrong? But your case and theirs are not parallel, yourselves being witnesses. In no one instance cited by you, do you pretend to assert that the parties agreed to receive the slavetraders to their pulpits and communion as Christians. For fifteen months have I sought, in connexion with the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and others, to show the Free Church her sin. I have preferred against her one single charge, and *only* one, which is, SHE HAS FORMED A CONFEDERACY WITH MANSTEALERS; engaging to receive them to her communion and pulpits as "honoured, evangelical Christians, serving God in the Gospel of his Son. (See speeches of Cunningham, Candlish, Lewis, Nixon, &c.; deliverances of Assembly and Commission; the letters of Dr. Chalmers, and the *Witness*, and *Warder*, and *Border Watch*, Free Church papers.) This charge you have never denied, but have uniformly tried to justify yourselves in forming this alliance, and have laboured to convince the people of this kingdom that American manstealers are Christians, and ought to be received as such.

Here is the difference between the Free Church and the instances you quote as parallel:—You went to those slavetraders as to Christians; the others did not. You solicited money of them as of Christians; the Rose Street Church, the Argyle Square Chapel, the Missionary Societies, &c. did not. You engaged to receive them to your pulpits and communion as Christians, and your delegates entered their pulpits and sat at their communion in Christian fellowship; the cotton merchants did not: they gave their money to you with the understanding that you were to recognise them as Christians, for they never would have given it had you refused; they sold their goods to merchants with no such understanding. Thus your case differs from all the instances you quote to cover your sins. The PRICE, the DREADFUL PRICE, which you paid for the money! You consented to league the Son of God, in loving fellowship with manstealers! You sold your Saviour for £3000!! You betrayed the world's Redeemer into the hands of slave-breeders and slave-traders for money!! You consented to place him in the company of *man*stealers, AS ONE OF THEM—and you are now trying to get all Scotland to help you to keep Him there! You insist that those who breed and rear men for the market as brute beasts, are one with Christ, a part of His body,

have His mind, are partakers of His nature, and that Christ is one with them!!! Such is the dreadful price paid by you for the money obtained of slaveholders, for they never would have given it had you not paid that price. Thus to associate Christ with manstealers, is to betray Him into the hands of His deadliest enemies. This price was never paid by merchants for their money or their goods.

Besides, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Methodists, the Secession and Relief Churches, the Voluntaries and Dissenters, years ago, have been rebuked for whatever countenance they gave, or *seemed* to give, to slaveholders; and that, too, by *yourselves*, while you were in the Establishment. What has been the result? All these denominations have adopted the principle of no fellowship in the pulpit, nor at the communion, with slaveholders. The proof of this you will find in the recent decisions of the Relief and Secession Synods; in the condemnation of their delegates to America by the Baptists and Congregationalists years ago; in the refusal of the Methodist Conference, last year, to admit a slaveholder to sit as a member; and in the Report of the London Anti-Slavery Committee, giving the proceedings of the world's Anti-Slavery Convention in 1843. All that is now asked of you is, that you would go and do likewise.

How is it that you now so strenuously sustain your own delegates to America in doing the very thing which you formerly condemned the delegates of the Congregationalists and Baptists for doing? Then you were in what you now call "Erastian bondage"—"Egyptian darkness." Now you call yourselves the *free* Church, the *pure* Church, the *immaculate* Church of Scotland. Yet, now you traverse the ocean to throw yourselves into the loving embrace of manstealers, the very thing which you severely condemned the *Voluntaries* for doing, while you were in the State Church. You once could lavish upon GEORGE THOMPSON your highest applause for his noble zeal and fidelity in rebuking a Cox and Hoby, a Reid and Mathieson, for truckling to the slaveholders of America; and now you denounce him as an Infidel, a deceiver, and full of all subtlety, because he rebukes your Cunningham, Candlish, and Chalmers, for a far meaner and more abject subserviency to the same manstealing horde.

Cease your obstinate perseverance in this covenant with manstealers. Imitate the various bodies of Dissenters. Adopt the principle that NO SLAVEHOLDER SHALL BE ALLOWED TO SIT AT YOUR COMMUNION, OR TO PREACH IN YOUR PULPITS, and the work is done.

But you say, if we do this—WE MUST SEND BACK THE MONEY. For this reason, and for no other, I say, then SEND BACK THE MONEY, that you may renounce the fellowship. You yourselves have declared that you cannot exclude slaveholders from your pulpits and communion while their money is in your coffers. As a preliminary step to renouncing the fellowship—you are urged TO SEND BACK THE MONEY. Do as your SECESSION and RELIEF neighbours have done; say to slaveholders—We can have no more fellowship with you as Christians till you repent; and then go and get all the money of them which they are willing to give. You would get no more £3000, but you would get something much less to your taste.

SEND BACK THE MONEY!

Your sincere friend and well-wisher,

HENRY C. WRIGHT.

EDINBURGH, *May* 20, 1846

ANTI-SLAVERY SOIREE IN EDINBURGH,

On Tuesday, the 9th June.

Tuesday night, the friends of negro emancipation in the United States gave a fruit soiree, in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, to Messrs. Thompson, Douglass, Buffum, and Wright, on the occasion of their leaving that city, to prosecute elsewhere the work of agitation in which they have been engaged for several weeks against the Free Church of Scotland, in reference to its connection with the slave-holding churches of America. The hall was crowded to overflowing by a most respectable audience, a large proportion of whom were ladies. Councillor Stott occupied the chair.

After singing a hymn, the Chairman shortly addressed the meeting on the pleasure with which he had witnessed the success and popularity of the Anti-slavery mission in this city.

The Very Rev. Archdeacon Williams then presented himself, and proposed the following resolution:—"That the slavery which now exists in certain States of the American Union is contrary to the spirit and vital system of the Christian revelation, and an oppressive iniquity which no faithful Christian should connive at or palliate." The Very Rev. Archdeacon entered into a long exegetical argument to show that the interpretation put upon various passages of Scripture in the General Assembly of the Free Church was not warranted by the original Greek—a language which he had studied for the greater part of his life. He denied most emphatically that the phraseology of the New Testament warranted any one in drawing the inference that the Apostles either admitted, or would not have hesitated to admit, slave-owners to the Lord's table. He dwelt particularly on the rule of conduct laid down by our Saviour and his Apostles as to the different relations of society, as a proof that the spirit of the Gospel, and the example of its divine promulgators, were totally at variance with a system of slavery.

The Rev. George Robson, of the United Secession Church, Lauder, cheerfully seconded the resolution; and, at the same time, urged all to exert themselves in putting an end to the system of slavery which existed in the United States—a system which was accursed of God and accursed of man.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; as were all the others subsequently submitted to the meeting.

The Rev. Dr. Ritchie proposed the next resolution, which was to the effect that the friends of emancipation assembled there should tender Mr. Buffum their warmest thanks for his disinterested zeal in behalf of the oppressed negro in the United States; and at the same time award him the utmost praise for the exertions which he had made in this country to cause the Free Church to relinquish the obnoxious alliance into which she had entered with the slave-holding churches in America. The Doctor, in supporting this resolution, took occasion to advert to what had been said in the General Assembly of the Free Church on the question of American slavery. He would be sorry indeed to sit at the feet of such Gamaliels as Drs. Chalmers, Cunningham, and Candlish, and learn theology from them on this subject. He would be equally sorry to follow the dictum of Dr. Brown on this question; for it appeared to him that all of them had, as yet, to learn what were the first principles of the oracles of the living God regarding it. They had been told by Dr. Candlish in the General Assembly that he had high authority for the ground which he occupied—that he had the authority of Dr. Brown, the leading intellect in the Secession Church. This was a discovery, or, as Archdeacon Williams would call it, an invention, at which he was certainly much surprised. There were some men in the church to which he (Dr. R.) belonged, who would be found as exalted in talent and in influence as that man. [Hisses and slight applause.] He did not object to their hissing; but he really must say again, that he thought it strange that they should put the whole of the church to which he belonged under one man. [Hisses.] He cared neither for the gods of the hills nor the valleys; but he would like to ask, since Dr. Candlish thought so highly of Dr. Brown's intellect on the question of slavery, what he thought of Dr. Brown's intellect on the subject of the atonement? [Loud and repeated hissing, and slight applause.]

The Rev. Mr. Robson—I call Dr. Ritchie to order. If I had known that this subject was to have been introduced, I never would have been here. I ask, Mr. Chairman, is Dr. Ritchie or is he not in order; for I humbly submit that this subject should never have been introduced at this meeting.

Dr. Ritchie—It was only in the mode of argument which I adopted on this question, setting one authority against another.

The Chairman—While I do not yield to any individual present in admiration and esteem for the talents and character of Dr. Brown, I must say that, having calmly looked at the whole course of argument adopted by the Rev. Doctor, I think it was complimentary rather than the reverse to Dr. Brown. It appears to me that in this discussion there ought and should be a complete setting aside of Dr. Brown or Dr. Paul, when they come in the way of the authority of Christ.

Mr. George Thompson—I sat in the General Assembly of the Free Church on Saturday the 30th of May, and I heard Dr. Candlish, to the satisfaction of a very large audience, dispose entirely of the unanimous decision of the United Secession Synod—and here, let me mention, that Dr. Brown was not in the Synod at the time the decision was come to, but afterwards protested against it—I say that I heard Dr. Candlish dispose of the unanimous decision of the whole body of the Secession ministers, by simply saying that Dr. John Brown, the leading intellect in that Church, had entered his dissent against the resolution that had been come to. I do say, therefore, it is of importance—if Dr. John Brown will stand out in opposition to his whole Church—that we should be prepared to say whether the unanimous decision of his brethren, or the dictum of Dr. John Brown, is the right one. [Applause, and a slight hiss.]

Mr. Stott said he would put it to the meeting whether it would be right to call Dr. Ritchie to order when debating a question on public grounds. He had, therefore, no hestation in saying that Dr. Ritchie had not gone beyond the bounds of propriety.

Dr. Ritchie was then allowed to proceed. He said, the doctrines advocated in Canonmills were a disgrace to Scotland and a disgrace to its Christianity. He had been exhibited as showing the Free Church the road to Canonmills with his violin, but he was now perfectly ready to show them the road from Florida East to Jamaica.

The Chairman then rose and presented Mr. Buffum, on the occasion of his returning to America, with a copy of the Encyclopedia Britannica, bearing the following inscription:—"Presented to James N. Buffum, Esq. of Lynn, Massachusetts, U.S. by the friends of human freedom in Edinburgh, in testimony of their high admiration of his disinterested devotion to the cause of the slave in America—of his steady and consistent opposition to the prejudice against colour, and his laborious and efficient exertions in Scotland to induce the Free Church to send back the money received from the slaveholders."

Mr. Buffum made a brief and appropriate reply.

Mr. Douglass and Mr. Thompson next addressed the meeting, showing the present state of slavery in the United States, and the prejudices which existed against the negro population. They also traced the connection of the Free Church of Scotland with the churches of that country, and commented on the untenable nature of the defence which had been set up in the Assembly to justify that connection. They declared their intention to agitate the churches of England on the subject, in order to bring their influence to bear on the feeling which so generally prevailed in this country as to sending back the money, and abandoning the connection of the slaveholding churches of America.

The Rev. Mr. Lamb, of Portobello, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Arthur, Edinburgh, proposed a motion, expressing union of sentiment with Messrs. Thompson, Douglass, and Wright, on the question of American slavery.

The meeting broke up at 12 o'clock.

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

AND THE

QUESTION OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

On Wednesday evening last, a meeting was held in the City Hall, for the purpose of affording Messrs. George Thompson and Henry C. Wright an opportunity of submitting the speeches of the Rev. Drs. Cunningham, Candlish, and Duncan, in the Free Church Assembly, on Saturday the 30th of May, on the subject of communion with the members of slaveholding churches, to the judgment of the Glasgow public. The meeting was numerously and respectably attended; and the platform was covered by members and friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, among whom we noticed Principal Dewar, D.D. LL.D. President of the Aberdeen Anti-Slavery Society.

Mr. William Smeal, on proposing the Chairman, congratulated his friends and fellow-citizens, that he had the pleasure on that occasion of submitting to them, as chairman of the meeting, the name of his friend George Jeffrey. [Loud applause.] He having been the first to propose a resolution condemnatory of the conduct of the Free Church in receiving the contributions of slaveholders, and admitting them to Christian fellowship; and when thus met to report the progress of their agitation in regard to this question, and to pledge themselves to continued efforts in the cause, until the great object at which they aimed was accomplished, he did think it peculiarly appropriate that George Jeffrey should occupy the chair. [Cheers.]

The Chairman, in opening the meeting, said, that he had much pleasure in occupying the chair on this occasion. It had been stated as a reason why he should occupy it, that at a meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, held two years ago, he had proposed the first resolution made on any platform in this country in reference to the Free Church of Scotland receiving the contributions of the American pro-slavery churches, and calling upon the members of the Free Church, if they had then received it, to send back the money. Such was but an echo of the object of the present meeting; and he believed, whatever might be said to the contrary, that the time was not far distant when the Free Church would be heartily ashamed of their connection with the pro-slavery churches of the American Union. He had much pleasure in stating to the audience that, a few days ago, the Synod of the United Secession Church, with which he was connected, had (he might say unanimously, there being only one dissentient member in all that large and influential body) declared, that they refuse to hold Christian fellowship with those churches in America who may sanction slavery in that country; other Christian bodies had done the same. He had little doubt that the connection at present existing between the Free Church and the American pro-slavery churches would be found to be of the slenderest description. It could not exist in opposition to the religious public opinion of Scotland; nay, he believed, could it cease gracefully, it would cease speedily. Every one could see, however, that the step towards the termination of it has been taken, and that it would, ere long, come in spite of the speeches in favour of its continuance. He held in his hand a letter from Dr. Willis and Mr. Macbeth, both, as the audience knew, members of the Free Church, confirmatory of his conviction, that the Free Church would, ere long, cease to occupy its present position towards the American pro-slavery churches, unless they put their sin entirely away from them. He should read that letter, and then proceed more immediately to the business of the evening.

To William Smeal,

Secretary of the Glasgow Emancipation Society.

Glasgow, 10th June, 1846.

Dear Friend,—Although, as we have already explained to you, we think it better that we should do our part in promoting the anti-slavery cause, by availing ourselves of the opportunities which are open to us within the Courts of the Free Church, than by joining in the present agitation out of doors; yet, on no occasion would we shrink from giving the benefit of our avowed sentiments, on this great subject, to the friends of justice and humanity. Nor will we desert your noble and sacred cause even when we find you, or others associated with you, employed in combating the unhappy arguments of friends and brethren to whom we owe love and respect; but from whose judgment on the question of fellowship with slaveholders we entirely dissent.

We, as much as any of you, disapprove of the *theology* by which it is sought to justify inter-communion with slaveholders, and churches abetting or conniving at slavery, under the plea that reproof or expostulation is more likely to be successful, while inter-communion is still continued, than if it were abandoned. This seems to us to be at variance with all sound ideas of religious or ecclesiastical fellowship. We do not deny that we ought to remonstrate, and that in the spirit of true and faithful brotherhood, even with such whom we are commanded to "note" as walking disorderly, and from whom we are commanded to "withdraw." But, to recognise their right, meanwhile, to fellowship in the most sacred and sealing privileges of the Church, and to concede free interchange of pulpit ministrations with those whom we believe and allow to be perpetrating a great sin, seems to be little else than a tolerating the sin, while we remonstrate with the parties committing it. And we can find no warrant to expect the Divine blessing on mere doctrinal remonstrances, unaccompanied with that practical testimony of decided withdrawal from them, which the word of God enjoins, as much as it enjoins remonstrance itself; and that as a means even of reclaiming an erring party, and so demonstrating our deep impression of his sin, as well as faithfulness to his soul.

It is our decided conviction, that the time has more than come when the Church of Christ throughout the whole world should combine, in very mercy to the slaveholding brethren in America, to declare, that they cannot recognise as churches walking orderly those who are faithlessly compromising truth on this momentous subject—submitting, even without complaint or testimony, to the most iniquitous and Erastian laws ever enacted by men privileged to live in Gospel light; yea, taking part, as both professing Christians and ministers of Christ in the southern states are notoriously doing, not by silence only, but by active compliance and advocacy, in wreathing the yoke of cruel bondage about the necks of millions of their fellow-creatures—a bondage so degrading and demoralising in itself, and in its accompaniments, that we own we should be happier to see our clerical brethren at home apologising even for what may seem the excessive or outrageous zeal of some of the abolitionists, than placing themselves in the attitude of seeming apologists for the oppressor.

We know that they do not design to plead for slavery: we honour their fearless avowal of their resolution to follow their convictions on this whole question, uninfluenced by the existing agitation: But, though we do not acknowledge public sentiment to be a rule either of our faith or theirs; yet, persuaded as we are, that the public sentiment—now, we trust, the general sentiment in British religious society—as to this question, is as truly founded on reason and scripture, as it is opposed to the judgment of the Free Church Assembly; we long to see our Church take the ground to which we believe it must and will come, if it would either benefit the souls of the Transatlantic brethren, or save itself from participation in their plagues. (Signed) Michl. Willis, Minister.
James Macbeth, Minister.

[The sentiments expressed in the letter were loudly cheered by the audience.]

Mr. Wright then addressed the meeting. Within a brief period, he said, Mr. Thompson and himself had attended thirteen large public meetings in Edinburgh; and the inhabitants of that city were now deeply agitated on this question, especially since the meeting of the Free Church General Assembly. They had in various ways received the testimony of the citizens of Edinburgh respecting their views on this question. One of the most interesting exhibitions of which, as it might be considered an expression of the public sentiment of Edinburgh, consisted in the fact that the Town Council had conferred upon Mr. George Thompson the freedom of the City. [Applause.] The

main object of the meeting this evening was to examine the speeches made on the occasion of the introducing the question of communion with slaveholding churches into the Free Assembly on the 30th of May. He wished to call attention to a few of the leading speakers on that occasion; for, excepting their noble friend, Mr. Macbeth of Glasgow, who stood in that Assembly alone, there was no one who showed that he was on the side of the oppressed against the oppressor; and the people of the Free Church and the people of Scotland would yet thank him for what he had done. The first point to which he wished to call the attention of those present, was the spirit which pervaded the speakers on that occasion, and their unblushing denial of the facts touching American slavery, and the connexion of the American churches with American slavery—these facts being matters of notoriety to the world. Mr. Wright then went on to show, in opposition to the statements made in the Free Assembly, that the slaves in America were held and used as property—as chattels personal—that the marriage relation amongst the slaves was not recoguised as sacred by the slaveholders, and that slaves were not permitted to read the Bible. He then ridiculed the idea advanced by Dr. Candlish, that slavery only existed in a "little corner" of America, the fact being, that the system was spread over a territory of one million of square miles, whereas fifty years ago, it was confined to an extent of 210,000 square miles. The slave population amounted to 3,000,000; and twelve of the fourteen states hadea ch a territory nearly as large as both Scotland and England put together; and yet they were told that slavery only existed in a small corner. [Cheers.] The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America was partly composed of manstealers—sinners of the first rank; and the General Assembly of the Free Church were in close alliance with that assembly. [Hear, hear.] After showing that the Government of the United States had been administered for forty-four years out of the sixty which it had existed, by slaveholding Presidents, and that all the ambassadors to foreign Powers, with, perhaps, one exception, were slaveholders, he said, after this question was settled, the next step the people of this country should take, should be to call upon the Government not to permit any ambassador to come from that country who was known to be a manstealer. They should not only refuse Christian fellowship, but political fellowship with this hoard of thieves. [Great applause.] He maintained that the slaveholders in America were greater thieves than if they were horsestealers or sheepstealers; and that the Free Church, in allying themselves to the slaveholding churches of the United States, knowing their character, were themselves incorporated as a part of a great confederacy of thieves. [Applause.] He concluded by declaring, that if the Free Church held on by this alliance that she must fall; or rather, he should say, that if Drs. Cunningham and Candlish held on by it they must fall before the glorious majesty of the principle of emancipation, and unless they repented they would fall with infamy. [Cheers.]

In introducing Mr. Thompson, the CHAIRMAN said that the meeting had with them this evening the youngest freeman of the metropolis of Scotland. [Cheers.] Not long ago the citizens of Glasgow were convened in the same hall to do honour to one who had now ceded his place as youngest freeman of the city of Edinburgh to him who was present this evening. The former came to them dignified by rank—the latter dignified by deeds of benevolence; the former noble by birth—the latter noble by nature; the former, one who had occupied the place of First Minister of the Crown, and still held a high place in the legislative assembly of the nation—the latter, ere long, to have a seat side by side in that assembly with Lord John Russell himself. [Cheers.] He was glad to find that gentleman present with them. They delighted to do him honour. They could not forget his devotedness to anti-slavery and his deeds in its behalf. Scotland had learned the lesson of anti-slavery from his lips. [Cheers.] It was in the speaker's recollection, when first of all the gentleman present with them appeared before an Edinburgh audience with only a good cause and a warm heart, and then but little known to Scotland; and now, go where you might, you should find that the name of George Thompson was known and revered throughout the land. Nor were his name and exertions confined to the British Isles. He was known and loved in British India, and in the United States of America. Everywhere he was hailed as the warm friend of humanity—the hearty lover of freedom—the ready patron of every right measure for the education and civilisation of the race—and the unflinching advocate of the cause of the oppressed. Following the convictions of an enlightened conscience, they would ever find him at his post, unscared by opposition, and earnest in the advancement of every important work of freedom, benevolence, and religion.

Mr. THOMPSON, having disclaimed all enmity to the Free Church as such, said—you are gathered within these walls to-night to consider the conduct of the Free Church of Scotland—(as represented in the General Assembly)—on the subject of slavery. I am here to lay before you the views which have been authoritatively promulgated by the highest court in the Free Church of Scotland on the subject of human rights, and to ask your deliberate and solemn verdict in reference to those views. (Cheers.) I am here to show the connection which now subsists between the Free Church of Scotland and the slaveholders of the United States of America, and to ask you, whether you will sanction it, as consistent with the rights of every member of the human family, with the revealed will of God, and with the duty of the Free Church; or condemn it, as a blow to the cause of freedom, a violation of the divine law, and a guilty dereliction of duty on the part of a body calling itself a Church of Christ. The history of the question before you is well known, but there are a few facts which I deem it of importance to recall to your remembrance. The ministers who now mainly, if not entirely, compose the General Assembly of the Free Church (in conjunction with lay delegates) were formerly members of the Established Church of Scotland—were ministers in connection with that Establishment, and resident in this country. Their present leaders were men officiating in this city or in Edinburgh. Bear this in mind. Remember, further, that the question of American slavery is no new question in Scotland. On the passing of the Act for the abolition of British Colonial slavery, the attention of the friends of emancipation was almost immediately directed to the subject of American slavery. Lectures on the subject were delivered, and public meetings were held in this city, in Edinburgh, and in many other parts of Scotland. Societies, too, were formed, for the especial purpose of affording assistance to the Abolitionists of America, in their efforts to promote the cause of abolition upon the principle of immediate and unconditional emancipation. That there may be no mistake upon this subject, I will read an extract from the declaration of the American Anti-Slavery Convention, assembled in Philadelphia on the fourth of December, 1833—a document brought forward and approved in almost every meeting held in Scotland during the year 1834. The words of that declaration are as follow:—

"We maintain that in view of the civil and religious privileges of this nation, the guilt of its oppression is unequalled by any other on the face of the earth; and therefore,

"That it is bound to repent instantly, to undo the heavy burden, to break every yoke, and to let the oppressed go free.

"We further maintain—That no man has a right to enslave or embrute his brother; to hold or acknowledge him for one moment, as a piece of merchandise—to keep back his hire by fraud; or to brutalize his mind by denying him the means of intellectual, social, and moral improvement.

"The right to enjoy liberty is inalienable. To invade it is to usurp the prerogative of Jehovah. Every man has a right to his own body—to the products of his own labour—to the protection of law—and to the common advantages of society. It is piracy to buy or steal a native African, and subject him to servitude. Surely the sin is as great to enslave an AMERICAN as an AFRICAN.

"Therefore we believe and affirm—That there is no difference *in principle*, between the African slave trade and American slavery:

"That every American citizen, who retains a human being in involuntary bondage as his property, is, according to Scripture, Exodus xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7. a MANSTEALER.

Such were the principles of the American Abolitionists, made known to, and cordially approved by, the abolitionists of this country. Upon these principles, which I am prepared by incontestible evidence to prove, were the principles of the society I represented during the whole of the period I was employed as an anti-slavery agent, previous to the abolition of our own colonial system—upon these principles a number of societies were formed in this country, for aiding in the work of universal emancipation. One of these societies was formed in this city, another was formed in Edinburgh, and by both I was delegated to America, as the exponent and advocate of these principles in their broadest signification. [Cheers.] A society was also formed in London, upon the same principles, as will be seen from the following extract from an Address to the President, Senate, Representatives, and people of the United States:—"We de-

and its desolating curse? *Preachers of the Gospel*, so-called, resident south of the Potomac, and many to the north of that river, who are their brother coadjutors, *either are 'possessed of a dumb devil' on this subject, or they only quote the Scriptures, Satan-like, to falsify their meaning, and to defend the Heaven-defying abominations which so loudly call for the just vengeance of their dishonoured and insulted master*, Jesus, the friend of sinners, who came 'to preach the Gospel to the poor, and to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captive, to set at liberty them who are bruised, and to seek and to save that which was lost.' 'Wo unto you, blind guides, who strain at a gnat and swallow a camel! Wo unto you who shut up the kingdom of Heaven!'"

You have heard and seen a good deal recently, about the hard language, and coarse epithets, and unchristian denunciations of George Thompson and his colleagues. What think you of Dr. Cunningham and his colleagues? [Cheers.] Here is a sample of their meekness, and courtesy, and delicate consideration of the feelings of their brethren in America, who have "fallen into an unhappy predicament"—or have "happened to find themselves in possession of slaves"—or, "have been led, by the providence of God, into their present position"—or, "are in such circumstances, that it would be sin to emancipate their slaves." Here is a sample of their refined urbanity—their double-distilled essence of friendly phraseology. [Loud laughter and cheers.] How do you like it?

Are you not ready to chide us for our dulness, in having profited so little by the example set us in 1835? We are prepared to say that we have fallen far short of our teachers, and we are willing to go back to this neglected book, and, for the time to come, to speak in the language of Dr. Cunningham and his brethren, who so long ago kindly undertook to instruct us in the terms we should apply to American *Christian* slaveholders. [Cheers.] We hear of persons in the present day who are ready to vouch for the Christian character of living slaveholders, and for the piety and beatitude of those who have departed this life, leaving their slaves still in bondage; but what says Dr. Cunningham in his book? See page 75:—

"Admitting that a Christian may extenuate his holding slaves while he lives—*a doctrine, however, which is quite incompatible with divine truth*—how he can die and transfer them as property, is a mystery which defies all human solution. Every deceased American slaveholder, since the 4th of July, 1776, *died a man-thief*, and a mist of darkness hovers over his grave, which no fire of Christian love, that "hopeth all things," can possibly dissipate."

Hear this, ye reverend conclaves, who, if the papers do not bear false *Witness* against ye, have recently authenticated the Christian character of American slave-holders! Dr. Cunningham tells ye, that the doctrine, that a Christian may hold slaves, is wholly incompatible with divine truth. Hear this, ye slave-holding Presbyterians of America—there hovers over the graves of your fathers, and will hover over your's, a mist of darkness, that not the fire of that divine charity which "hopeth all things," can possibly dissipate. Dr. Cunningham declares ye are *man-thieves*, and warns ye to escape the perdition that awaits ye. [Hear, hear.] We hear it adduced as evidence in the present day, of the piety of slaveholders in America, that they devote considerable sums to the promulgation of the Gospel; and we are told to look at their recent contribution to the Free Church of Scotland. Are we then to doubt the genuineness of the religion of these men; and ought the Free Church, or any other body, to decline the contributions of these liberal and pious men? Happily for us, Dr. Cunningham has answered this question. He says plainly, "No slaveholder can be a Christian." "No slaveholder ought to be admitted into a Christian Church, or being in, ought to be suffered to remain."

On page 91, he says,—

"*Every slaveholder, peremptorily and without delay, must be excommunicated from the church of God.* It is of no importance what titles, what office, what station, or what rank the slaveholder may hold, or what apparent virtues or talents he may possess and develop. To all these specious pleas, and to all his anti-Christian white-washing, there is a concise, significant, and irrefutable reply—*He is a man-stealer!* But as a man-stealer is the very highest criminal in the judgment of God, and of all rational uncorrupted men, he cannot be a Christian; and, therefore, it is an insult to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, to record the most notorious criminal as an acceptable member of "the household of faith."

And then, as to the liberality of a slaveholder being an evidence of piety, and as to the consistency of taking money from him for religious purposes, Dr. Cunningham says :—

"To this (assertion that the slaveholder cannot be a Christian) it will be retorted—remember the large donations which are contributed by the southeren churches to benevolent institutions, as a proof of their philanthropy and religion. With the deepest pungency and mortification is that fact recollected; *nor is it less regretted, that their presents are even received for any avowed holy purposes.* Greatly to be deplored is that unhallowed combination in our country, which so influences our northern Christian citizens, that they will accept the spoils of kidnappers, as suitable votive offerings to the treasury of brotherly love, or Christian zeal—for *all the gifts of the hordes of southern men-stealers to the fund of evangelical service*, are most painfully, but instructively delineated by the prophet Isaiah, chapter lxvi. verse 3; 'He that killeth an ox, is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, is as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; and he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. They have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations.'"

It is lamentable to reflect upon the fact that, though this book has been circulating in this country during a period of eleven years, there are yet to be found men who will rise in a Christian assembly, and vindicate the claim of the manstealer to the name and standing of a Christian; men who will take the money the slaveholder has wrung from the slave, at the expense of that slave's toil, and ignorance, and debasement, and everlasting ruin, and will apply that money to the building of churches, and the payment of ministers, in Scotland. Such men cannot say they have not been warned. Such men cannot say they are necessarily ignorant of the true state of things among the slaveholding churches of America. Such men cannot say the sin of such doings has never been pointed out. No. Dr. Cunningham is a witness against them. Here in this book, which he placed within their reach eleven years ago, he laid the horrid system bare. He has led them into the very *arcana* of this mystery of iniquity. He has selected from amongst the hord of criminals, chargeable with the stupendous sin of stealing a man in God's image, and making him a beast of burden, and a "chattel personal," the most atrocious criminal of all, and he has presented him in the person of the slaveholding minister of religion, saying :—"However plausible may be the pretexts, and however ingenious and urgent may be the excuse, we must categorically denounce the profession of Christianity, in alliance with slaveholding, as *pestiferous hypocrisy.* We must sternly prohibit all slavedriving preachers from officiating in the sanctuary, or leading in any devotional exercises. And we must copy the high and holy example of Jesus of Nazareth, the Head of the Church; who, when he saw that the Jewish disciples of Mammon had transformed 'the house of prayer into a den of thieves,' cast them all out of the temple. Thus must we unsparingly act; we must eject every man-stealer, without exception, from 'the communion of saints,' instantly and for ever." Modern apologists for slavery, therefore, are without excuse; and Dr. Cunningham and his friends, though they were entitled to no thanks for their labours in the cause of the Free Church, would deserve the thanks of all the friends of human freedom, for having so completely unmasked the hypocrisy and guilt of men in the United States, who impiously claim to be ministers of Christ, while they traffic in slaves and the souls of men. In 1836 and 1837 there was no Free Church; but those who have formed that Church, though not then thoroughly enlightened on the nature of the dreadful sin of Erastianism, were keen in their perceptions of the henious sin of American slavery, and especially the sin of the American churches. They fearlessly, and even fiercely, rebuked the shortcomings of the delegates from the Baptists and Independents of England—they commended, in the strongest and most flattering terms, the fidelity I had shown in openly censuring the conduct of those who were the representatives of the Christian denominations to which I stood, both in my Anti-Slavery capacity and otherwise, most nearly connected—they rejected as false, or exaggerated, all the accounts given by Messrs. Reed and Matheson, and Cox and Hoby, of the vitality and piety of the American Churches. They were determined that the truth should be told, and they therefore signed a requisition to me, bearing, amongst other signatures, the names of Cunningham and Candlish, and of Alexander Dunlop, requesting me to lecture in the West Church, Edinburgh.

Let us now turn to the conduct of the Free Church of Scotland on this subject, and look at the position in which that Church now stands to the slaveholding churches and slaveholding ministers of America. (Cheers.) The active leaders in that church, it is well known, are Drs. Candlish and Cunningham. They were the men who organised and conducted the Non-intrusion agitation—they were the Moses and Aaron of that *exodus* which the Non-intrusionists made from the thraldom of an Erastian establishment. They have ever since been the controling minds in the Free Church; all besides have been mere subalterns, obeying the word of command proceeding from their lips. Well, it was resolved that there should be a deputation to America, and Dr. Cunningham was one of the members of that deputation. He and his colleagues were sent out *by*, and received their instructions, if any were given, *from* the men whose denunciations of slaveholding churches I have referred to. What was the conduct of these delegates from the anti-Erastian and Protesting Free Church of Scotland? What was Dr. Cunningham's conduct—the conduct of the man who inculcated upon the minds of the people of Scotland the sentiments I have quoted? These delegates, Dr. Cunningham included, proved themselves utterly false to the principles of their own secession from the Establishment—utterly recreant to their anti-slavery pledges and professions, and instead of mingling only with men of pure and consistent character, sought aid and sympathy from men who were practically the most guilty violators of the law of God, and the worst enemies of the human race. [Cheers.] Even had they left this country in ignorance of the true state of things in America, and of the effect which their union with slaveholders would have upon the cause of Emancipation, they were left without excuse for their conduct, seeing they were faithfully warned by the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Despite this warning, and of all other motives, they went into the midst of a community of manstealers. While in the midst of this community, they never once fulfilled their duty as ministers of Christ. They were silent on the subject of slavery. They stood in the city of Baltimore, but were *dumb*. They stood up in Richmond, Virginia, but were *dumb*. One of their number travelled thousands of miles in the Southern States, but he was *dumb*. Two of these representatives of the Free Church sat in the General Assembly of the United States, and saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears, the scorn and opposition with which the claims of the slave were treated; but there, as every where else, they were *dumb*—they opened not their mouths—they consented to the enslavement of three millions of the human race—they professed to bear a commission from Christ to declare the whole counsel of God, but they said not a word for their master—they were in the midst of the enemies of the Prince of Peace—of him who came to preach deliverance to the captives, but they were *dumb*. They saw their Saviour represented in the persons of three millions of slaves; but they passed him by unheeded, and never addressed one word of admonition to those who, in enslaving the negro, had made merchandise of Christ himself, who died that the negro might be free. They entered the house of Dives, and sat down with him to meat, but they disregarded the bleeding Lazarus at his gate, covered with sores, and bound with fetters. [Great cheering.] The subsequent remonstrances of these men, and of those who vindicate their conduct, cannot but excite the contempt of the slaveholder, and of all who can discern the hypocrisy of those who were silent when in the presence of the abomination of slavery, and now seek to obtain an Anti-Slavery reputation by sending a diluted and time-serving letter to the slaveholder. [Cheers.] But what greatly aggravates the guilt of these men, is the fact, that this silence originated in the low and sordid desire to obtain money from the slaveholders of America. Their mission to the United States was to obtain money. In the United States, as every where else, the leaders of the Free Church party have sought to convert the sympathy manifested in their behalf into money. For the sake of money, therefore, they were willing to betray by silence the cause of the bleeding slave; and although their master, Christ, was infinitely more dishonoured by the slaveholding churches of America than he had ever been in the Erastian Church of Scotland, they were willing to fellowship in the closest bonds the slaveholders of America, if they might thereby procure money to swell the fund with which they intended, if possible, to o'ertop the Church from which they had seceded. [Cheers.] I need not inform you that all that these men did abroad has been warmly commended by the leaders of the Free Church at home. Mr. Thompson then proceeded to review the various measures of the Free Church, from the return

of the deputation, down to the late General Assembly, including the letter published in the *Witness* of the 6th, to the Presbyterian Church of America, and concluded by an earnest exhortation to a persevering demand upon the Free Church to send back the money; and sat down amidst loud applause.

At the close of Mr. Thompson's address, several individuals seemed anxious to address the meeting, and the chairman announced that an adjournment was to take place till next night; but this was objected to by some, and

Mr. James Pinkerton got up and asked if it was justice to adjourn the meeting without hearing those who wished to reply to the falsehoods—the direct falsehoods—uttered by Mr. Thompson? [Great disapprobation and confusion.]

Mr. M'Skimmon, Student of Divinity, in connection with the Free Church, then addressed the meeting, amidst much noise, laughter, and impatience, in support of the views of that Church on the question of slavery, declaring at the same time that if the American Churches did not listen to their remonstrances, that the students of the Free Church, at least, were prepared to do their duty, when the proper time came, in repudiating all connection with the slaveholding churches.

Mr. James Pinkerton spoke next amidst increased confusion. Mr. Thompson, he thought, might be better employed than to be going about with an impudent foreigner, who calumniated and slandered the best men in the country. [Great disapprobation.] Mr. Thompson had tried to lead the meeting to believe that Dr. Cunningham was the author of the preface to the book from which he had quoted, when he well knew that he was not. [Mr. Thompson: I never said anything of the kind.] His whole argument went as assuming that the pamphlet was indorsed by Dr. Cunningham. [Hear, hear.] Mr. P. went on to characterise some of Mr. Thompson's statements as barefaced falsehoods, which called forth a torrent of disapprobation, when he retorted upon the meeting by calling them "rabid voluntaries." After some reference to Mr. Wright's peculiar views in regard to the sanctity of the Sabbath, he concluded by saying that if it was from such men they were to get their theology, he wished them joy of it.

Mr. Thompson made a few observations in reply.

Mr. Alex. Jamieson then proposed an adjournment of the meeting, that the subject might be fully discussed next night on the Green. [Laughter and disapprobation.]

The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, submitted the following motion:—

Resolved—That we sincerely congratulate our valued friend and coadjutor in the cause of universal emancipation, George Thompson, Esq. on the honour recently conferred upon him by the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council of Edinburgh, in presenting him with the Freedom of the City; and would also express our admiration of the enlightened and liberal spirit by which the authorities of Edinburgh were actuated, in bestowing the highest distinction in their gift on the uncompromising advocate of Liberty to the Slave, and of Free Trade with all the world.

The resolution was carried amidst loud acclamations, and the meeting separated a little after 12 o'clock, the proceedings having occupied nearly five hours.

UNITED STATES, MEXICO, AND THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

(From our own Correspondent.)

New York, June 8th, 1846.

In my last letter I spoke of the probable action of the two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian church then holding their sessions at Philadelphia, on SLAVERY. Since that time the discussion of the subject in both bodies has ended; the following are the resolutions adopted, as embodying the general opinion of the members of each church.

In the *Old School* Assembly the subject was disposed of by a re-affirmation of the action taken in past years, in the following words:—

Our church has from time to time, during a period of nearly sixty years, expressed its views on the subject of slavery. During all this period it has held and uttered *substantially* the same sentiments—believing that this *uniform* testimony is true and capable of vindication from the word of God. The Assembly is at the same time clearly of the opinion that it has already deliberately and solemnly spoken on this subject with sufficient fulness and clearness. Therefore,

Resolved—That no further action upon this subject is at present needed.

The vote on these finally stood at the majority of 133 to 34.

The *New School* Assembly, after a very long discussion, adopted the following declaration, introduced by the Rev. Dr. Duffield of Detroit. The vote stood 97 to 27—70 majority in the affirmative. I am almost afraid to trespass on your space in consequence of the great length of the resolutions, but as I know you feel interested in the subject, and because of their intrinsic importance in containing the church action of the highest court of one of the most influential bodies of Christians in this country, I venture to subjoin them in full. In the last resolution you will perceive one of the distinctions between the Old and New School Presbyterians. The former hold that the General Assembly of their church possesses a legislative and judiciary authority over the whole body—the latter, that the power of making laws and deciding controversies, &c., belong only to the lower courts—the Assembly's power lying in withholding, or giving, its sanction to their proceedings. But this by the way.

"1. The system of slavery, as it exists in these United States, viewed either in the laws of the several states which sanction it, or in its actual operation and results in society, is intrinsically unrighteous and oppressive, and is opposed to the prescriptions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the gospel, and to the best interests of humanity.

"2. The testimony of the General Assembly, from A.D. 1787 to A.D. 1818, inclusive, has condemned it, and it remains still the recorded testimony of the Presbyterian Church of these United States against it, from which we do not recede.

"3. We cannot, therefore, withhold the expression of our deep regret that slavery should be continued and countenanced by any of the members of our churches; and we do earnestly exhort both them, and the churches among whom it exists, to use all means in their power to put it away from them. Its perpetuation among them cannot fail to be regarded by multitudes influenced by their example as sanctioning the system portrayed in, and maintained by, the statutes of the several slave-holding states wherein they dwell. Nor can any mere mitigation of its severity, prompted by the humanity and Christian feeling of any who continue to hold their fellow-men in such bondage, be regarded either as a testimony against the system, or as in the least degree changing its essential character.

"4. But while we believe that many evils incident to the system, render it important and obligatory to bear testimony against it, yet would we not undertake to determine the degree of moral turpitude on the part of individuals involved by it. This will doubtless be found to vary in the sight of God, according to the degree of light and other circumstances pertaining to each. In view of all the embarrassments and obstacles in the way of emancipation interposed by the statutes of the slave-holding States, and by the social influence affecting the views and conduct of those involved in it, we cannot pronounce a judgment of general and promiscuous condemnation, implying *that* destitution of Christian principle and feeling which should exclude from the table of the Lord all who should stand in the legal relation of masters to slaves, or justify us in withholding our ecclesiastical and Christian fellowship from them. We

rather sympathise with and would seek to succour them in their embarrassments, believing that separation and secession among the churches and their members, are not the methods God approves and sanctions for the reformation of his Church.

"5. While, therefore, we feel bound to bear our testimony against Slavery, and to exhort our beloved brethren to remove it from them as speedily as possible, by all appropriate and available means, we do at the same time condemn all divisive and schismatical measures tending to destroy the unity and disturb the peace of our Church, and deprecate the spirit of denunciation and inflicting severities, which would cast from the fold those whom we are rather bound by the spirit of the gospel, and the obligations of our covenant, to instruct, to counsel, to exhort, and thus to lead in the ways of God; and towards whom, even though they may err, to exercise forbearance and brotherly love.

"6. As a court of our Lord Jesus Christ, we possess no legislative authority; and as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, we possess no judiciary authority. We have no right to institute and prescribe tests of Christian character and Church membership, not recognised and sanctioned in the sacred Scriptures, and in our standards, by which we have agreed to walk. We must, therefore, leave this matter with the Sessions, Presbyteries, and Synods—the judicatories to whom pertains the right of judgment to act in the administration of discipline, as they may judge it to be their duty, constitutionally, subject to the General Assembly, only in the way of general review and control."

This last action is, I believe, a more decided condemnation of slavery than has ever before been given by any General Assembly of the Church. For while they shrink from determining, as some have done, that the "degree of moral turpitude" on the part of those individuals involved in upholding the system "justifies" a general and promiscuous condemnation "of all to such a degree as to imply that destitution of Christian principle and feeling" which should exclude from the table of sacramental communion, yet do they feel bound to bear their testimony against slavery as "intrinsically unrighteous and oppressive, opposed to the prescriptions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the gospel, and the best interests of humanity;" and deeply regretting that it should be countenanced by any members of the Church, do earnestly exhort "all its members among whom it exists to use all means in their power to put it away from them."

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

y of a Letter addressed by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the London Division of the Provisional Committee of the Proposed Evangelical Alliance.

Gentlemen,

The Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society trust that no apology will be deemed necessary on their part, for introducing to your serious attention a subject of great practical importance, in connexion with the object you have, for some time past, been endeavouring to realize.

You are probably aware, gentlemen, that, at this moment, there exist in thirteen of the states of the United States of North America nearly three millions of our fellow-creatures, of both sexes and all ages, in the dreadful condition of slavery. The liberty of these unhappy persons was never forfeited by crime. They are innocent human beings, who have been deprived of their freedom, by the most iniquitous of laws, to minister to the insatiable cupidity, the base passions, or the pride of their owners; and they are retained in their hard state of bondage by means the most revolting and cruel. They are the descendants, for the most part, of Africans, who were formerly removed, by fraud or violence, from their native homes by the slave dealer; and whether viewed in relation to their physical sufferings, or their moral condition; the outrage that has been committed on their nature and their rights; or the helplessness and the hopelessness of their condition, should be the objects of the deepest sympathy to all Christian men, and of earnest prayer, and zealous effort for their speedy deliverance.

You are also aware, gentlemen, that these slaves are merchantable commodities. In the eye of the law they are regarded as mere property, except when they commit crime, and can, therefore, be bought and sold, given away or bequeathed, to meet the necessities, or gratify the caprice, of their masters. They have no social or civil rights, and therefore no regard whatever is paid to the relationships they may sustain; and they not only can be, but are constantly subjected to the most heart-rending separations. From sixty to eighty thousand, and sometimes considerably more, pass from one hand to another, by sale, every year; whilst the mode in which many thousands of them are raised for the southern markets is too revolting to be described.

The law which regulates the condition of these slaves does not sanction their marriage. If they enter into arrangements to live together, as man and wife, it knows nothing of the relation, and consequently does not protect it. It may be sundered in a moment. The result is, that not only is the divine ordinance of matrimony set aside, but a disgraceful system of concubinage is established in

its place, and a degree of licentious indulgence generated, which is frightful to contemplate. Neither does the law recognise the parental relation. In this respect the children of slaves are placed on the same level with the offspring of brutes. Both are property. The father cannot protect his son from injustice; the mother her daughter from dishonour. The tears, the lamentations, the entreaties of parents, are no more regarded than the lowing of cattle; and, should they become troublesome, they are punished with severity.

The committee dwell not on the continual injustice inflicted on the slave, by depriving him of the legitimate fruits of his labor, or the liberty of choice in respect of his employment and employer; nor of the cruel modes which are resorted to for the purpose of coercing labor, and of enforcing obedience. These are too well known to need description. It is quite natural that a system, which violates all the essential rights of humanity, and outrages the laws of God, should lead to the practice of every enormity which wicked men could invent, or human nature endure.

The laws of the slave-states, moreover, rigidly exclude from the poor slaves all instruction, whether secular or moral. In some of the states the heaviest penalties may be inflicted for teaching them the use of letters; and in one state death itself is the punishment for a second offence. The consequence is, that, in a land which boasts of its enlightened Christianity and republican institutions, there is a heathen and enslaved population, from whose minds is systematically excluded not only the sacred verities of religion, but the commonest rudiments of knowledge. If, in some instances, light penetrates their minds, it only serves to make the surrounding darkness the more palpable and hideous.

And this deplorable state of things not only exists with the connivance, but is sustained, unhappily, by the direct participation of several sections of the professedly Christian church. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Baptists, Independents, are all implicated in the support of this criminal institution. Preachers—bishops, and presbyters, and pastors, and ministers; elders and deacons, and members are found among slave-holders and slave-sellers; and it is to be feared are, in many instances, not less exacting and cruel than are the men who do not profess to be actuated by their religious principles, but who, nevertheless, urge in their defence the pernicious example set them.

Now, gentlemen, it appears to the committee to be a sacred duty, on the part of all who are sincere in their profession of obedience to the righteous precepts of the gospel, and are influenced by its benign spirit, to plead the cause of the oppressed, and to judge between them and their oppressors.

In placing the foregoing statement before you, the committee venture respectfully to press on your attention the painful fact, that a large body of men in the United States, who profess and call themselves Christians, and who would feel no difficulty in subscribing your confession of faith, are the oppressors of their brethren, or the apologists of the system of slavery which exists in their country at the present time; and to implore you to pause before noticed, to say, that many of them are bearing organizations a noble testimony against slavery; that many of them have, and all are rapidly separating themselves, from official connexion with

those who violate, by their conduct, the fundamental principles of that religion they profess to exalt.

Composed, as the anti-slavery body is, of every class of Christian professors in this country, they cannot but feel deeply interested in the course you propose to adopt in this particular case; and will be highly gratified to learn that your decision is to exclude the parties referred to from the proposed Alliance.

I have the honour to be,

Gentlemen,

Yours very faithfully,

JOHN SCOBLE, Secretary.

Anti-Slavery Office, 27, *New Broad Street*,
27*th February*, 1846.

[The following Documents are respectfully submitted to your consideration.]

Copy of Resolutions passed by the General Anti-Slavery Convention, held in London during the month of June, 1840 .

JOSEPH STURGE, ESQ. in the Chair.

Moved by the Rev. John Angell James, of Birmingham, seconded by the Rev. J. H. Johnson, Vicar of Tilshead, Wiltshire; and supported by R. K. Greville, Esq., LL.D., Edinburgh, James Stanfield, Esq., Belfast; Rev. Thomas Binney, John Burnet, and Dr. Cox, of London; Rev. Thomas Swan, Birmingham; Rev. William Brock, Norwich; Josiah Forster, Esq., London; and by the Hon. J. G. Birney, the Rev. Henry Colver, H. Grew, George Bradburn, and H. P. Stanton, Esq., of the United States; and carried unanimously, the Convention standing:—

"That it is the deliberate and deep-rooted conviction of this Convention, which it thus publicly and solemnly expresses to the world, that slavery, in whatever form, or in whatever country it exists, is contrary to the eternal and immutable principles of justice, and the spirit and precepts of Christianity; and is, therefore, a sin against God, which acquires additional enormity when committed by nations professedly Christian, and in an age when the subject has been so generally discussed, and its criminality so thoroughly exposed.

"That this Convention cannot but deeply deplore the fact, that the continuance and prevalence of slavery are to be attributed, in a great degree, to the countenance afforded by many Christian churches, especially in the Western world, which have not only withheld that emphatic and public testimony against the crime which it deserves, but have retained in their communion, without censure, those by whom it is notoriously perpetrated.

"That this Convention, while it disclaims the intention or desire of dictating to Christian communities the terms of their fellowship, respectfully yet urgently recommends them to consider, whether it is not their incumbent duty to separate from their communion, all those persons who, after they have been faithfully warned, continue in the sin of enslaving their fellow-creatures, or holding them in slavery; a sin, by the commission of which, with whatever mitigating circumstances it may be attended in their own particular instance, they give the support of their example to the whole system of compulsory servitude, and the unutterable horrors of the slave-trade.

"That it be recommended to the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in the name of this Convention, to furnish copies of the above resolutions to the ecclesiastical authorities of the various Christian churches thoughout the world."

Copy of Resolutions passed by the General Anti-slavery Convention, held in London during the month of June, 1843.

SAMUEL GURNEY, ESQ. in the Chair.

Moved by the Rev. John Angell James, of Birmingham; seconded by by the Rev. John Ritchie, D.D., of Glasgow; supported by the Rev. Dr. Morison, of London; the Rev. John Birt, of Manchester; Joseph Sturge, Esq., of Birmingham; Capt. Charles Stuart, of Bath; and the Rev. Amos A. Phelps, and H. Howells, Esq., of the United States:—

"That this Convention hereby declares to the world its deliberate and solemn conviction that slavery, in whatever form or country it exists, is intrinsically opposed to all natural justice and genuine Christianity; that in proportion as these exert their legitimate vigour and influence in society, it must be destroyed; and that while the Convention deeply deplores the sanction or support still given to it, either overtly or tacitly, by so many churches and religious bodies, especially in the United States, it rejoices in the assurance that so many others are bearing their public and decided testimony against it, refusing to retain in their communion those who, after due admonition, persist in the justification and practice of it.

"That, encouraged by the progress of earnest sentiment and action on this subject, in the churches and religious bodies of America and other countries, this Convention repeats the testimony of the Convention of 1840; that, while it disclaims the intention or desire of dictating to Christian communities the terms of their fellowship, respectfully submits, that it is their incumbent duty to separate from their communion all those persons who, after they have been faithfully warned, in the spirit of the gospel, continue in the sin of enslaving their fellow-creatures, or holding them in slavery—a sin, by the commission of which, with whatever mitigating circumstances it may be attended in their own particular instance, they give the support of their example to the whole system of compulsory servitude, and the unutterable horrors of the slave-trade.

"That this Convention, while it passes no judgment on the particular forms of action which different friends of the slave, in different circumstances, may adopt, hereby expresses its cordial sympathy and high admiration of all those who, in a Christian spirit and by Christian methods, are sincerely and earnestly labouring to purify their respective religious connexions from all fellowship with, and support of this heinous sin."

REPLY.

PROPOSED EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE,
2 and 6, Exeter Hall, Strand, London,
March 14, 1846.

My dear Sir,—Your letter on behalf of the Anti-slavery Society was laid before the London Divisional Committee, and I have been directed by the committee to acknowledge the receipt of the same.

Believe me to be,
Very faithfully yours,

J. Scoble, Esq. ALEX. DIGBY CAMPBELL.

THE ENGLISH *VERSUS* THE SCOTCH INDEPENDENTS.

None are at present more fierce against the Free Church for holding fellowship with the Presbyterians of America than the Congregationalists or Independents. We are in possession of one or two facts regarding their conduct a few years ago towards certain Scotch slaveholders, which we may, if need be, recall to their recollection, and which may prove that they are not in this respect so very much holier than their neighbours, as they themselves would have us believe. Meanwhile, however, we would beg their attention, and the attention of other Dissenters equally rabid on this question, to a document which has just come under our observation, and which may interest them. It is not an old document, having been written and authorised only so recently as last month. It bears to be,—

"A FRATERNAL Address from the Sixteenth Annual Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, *most respectfully addressed* to the *Evangelical Churches* of the *United States* of *America*, with their Elders."

If our friends are somewhat surprised at this designation, what will they say to the first two paragraphs of the Address, as follow :—

"*Honoured Christian Brethren*,—We greet you affectionately, in the name and for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"We have reckoned it among the GREATEST HONOURS AND ADVANTAGES realized by our Union, that we have by its means OBTAINED FELLOWSHIP, both by letters and by DELEGATIONS, with VARIOUS COMMUNITIES of our evangelical brethren in your country; and now, after some REGRETTED SUSPENSION OF THAT FELLOWSHIP, we seem to discern an appropriate occasion for *addressing you in the love of our common Lord.*"

And what will they say further when we remind them, that *one* of the "various communities" with which the Congregational Union deem it so great an honour and advantage to have obtained fellowship, both by letter and delegation, was the very Presbyterian Church for holding fellowship with which the Free Church is now so vehemently and unsparingly abused? The Congregational Union of England and Wales regret the suspension of their fellowship with that very Church, and hail the present time as affording a good opportunity for reviving it!!

Nor is this all. The Address, which is altogether on the question of threatened war, and which never mentions the subject of slavery, concludes as follows :—

the earth shall fear Him."

These are noble words, conceived in a noble spirit, and truly worthy of the Christian men who abound among the Congregationalists of England. But what a rebuke do they furnish to the awfully narrow spirit and unchristian conduct displayed by many of the Congregationalists, and other Dissenters of Scotland, on this same question! It is refreshing to meet with such a contrast.

From the Planters' (La.) Banner.

THE SLAVE PAULINE—CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—NEGRO SLAVES AND OURANG OUTANGS—SLAVERY AND CIVILIZATION.

Col. Claiborne, of the New Orleans Jeffersonian, has an article in which he commends the course of the Governor in refusing to pardon the slave Pauline, who was lately executed: 1st. Because if hanging a woman is inhuman—as he thinks *it is*—the fault is in the code. 2d. Because criminals are too often permitted to escape; and thirdly, because "the Governor showed a proper appreciation of our peculiar social system, and of the character of the African race. While Slavery exists the moral standard must be so low with them, and their ideas of right and wrong so indefinite, they must necessarily be restrained by stringent laws. This would seem to be unjust and inhuman, but so are many other things that our social system make indispensable.—Government is itself an evil and a usurpation. Society is an infusion of wrongs and errors, but they are unavoidable incidents of organization.

"*Again*," says the Jeffersonian, "the commutation of the death penalty into imprisonment is *no punishment for a negro*. He is by nature sluggish and lazy. * * He is a greater slave in Africa than on a Louisiana plantation. It is of his bone, and flesh, and blood, and spirit. It is imprinted in him; burned upon his skin by the breath of God Almighty, and into his soul by irreversible destiny. Men in their folly, may strike from their limbs the fetters of bondage, but God stamped *slave* upon his soul, and slave to all intents and purposes, he will remain, whether here, where he enjoys every comfort, and is the happiest being alive, or in St. Domingo, where, having won freedom, he dwindled into savageism—in Jamaica, where he is either a robber or a drone—in the famed Liberia where his efforts at government are a satire on our own—or farther back in the depths of his native deserts, where, in physical strength, in courage, and intelligence, the *Ourang Outang* is his superior."

We agree with Col. Claiborne, that the negro slaves' idea of right and wrong is so indefinite they must be restrained by stringent laws. While we are opposed to capital punishment, we must admit that we think, in punishing slaves for certain offences, it should be resorted to. We are far from believing, however, that the Ourang Outang is the negro's *superior* in his native deserts, or that the negro will *always* remain a slave. The negro, we believe, is the connecting link between the Ourang Outang and the white man—we do not by any means, believe that the negro and the white descended from the same parents. Still, we believe that the negro is a *human* being, while the Ourang Outang is a brute. Man is distinguished from the brute, by his susceptibility of improvement. European civilization, from which we have our civilization, has endured fifteen centuries, and in all that time, it has been in a state of progression. To the African slave we of America are greatly indebted for the progress we have made; and while he has benefited us, we have conferred a great blessing on him, in teaching him how to WORK. We have greatly improved his faculties, his character, and con-

dition. American Slavery, we believe, will hereafter be the means of civilizing the whole negro race in Africa; it is now creating wealth, to build churches, and pay printers and preachers. It is the *material*, however, which has its value from the *spirit*—but we confidently believe that it will, in time, become spirit.

The editor of the Jeffersonian says that "Society is an infusion of wrongs and errors, but they are unavoidable incidents of organization." This is very true: our systems of labor, both *hired labor* at the North, and *slave labor* at the South, are "*wrongs*," which must in time bring about a change in the organization of society. Then we will have a higher order of civilization: we will be as far in advance of our present social organization as we are now in advance of the feudal ages. But Northern free labor and Southern slave labor will do very well for years to come. Competition, however, will ultimately bring about dreadful suffering, which must lead to a re-organization of society or civil war. God send that the latter alternative may be avoided. But our comments on Col. Claiborne's article, have run to a greater length than we intended. We will close with a quotation from Guizot's "History of Civilization in Europe:"

"The age of barbarian Europe, with its brute force, its violence, its lies and deceit,—the habitual practice under which Europe groaned during four or five centuries, are passed away forever, and has given place to a better order of things. We trust that the time now approaches when man's condition shall be progressively improved by the force of reason and truth, when the brute part of nature shall be crushed, that the godlike spirit may unfold."

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

God bless New Hampshire!—from her granite peaks,
Once more the voice of Stark and Langdon speaks.
The long-bound vassal of th' exulting South,
For very sh.. e her self-forged chain has broken,
Torn the black sea.. of slavery from her mouth,
And in the clear tones of her old time spoken!
Oh, all undreamed-of, all unhoped-for changes!—
The tyrant's ally proves his sternest foe,
To all his biddings, from her mountain ranges,
New Hampshire thunders an indignant No.
Who is it now despairs? Oh, faint of heart,
Look upward to those northern mountains cold,
Flouted by Freedom's victor-flag unrolled,
And gather strength to bear a manlier part.
All is not lost. The angel of God's blessing
Encamps with freedom on the field of fight.
Still to her banner, day by day, are pressing,
Unlooked for allies, striking for the right!
Courage, then, Northern hearts! Be firm, be true:
What one brave State hath done, can ye not also do?

From the True American.

SLAVEHOLDING MADNESS AND FANATICISM.

We call the attention of our readers to Mr. S. M.'s letter. It proves to what excess the human mind may reach, in a bad cause!

This man is surprised to see us "fighting against God" in attempting emancipation! Does not he know that thirteen States of this Union are free of slaves? Have they fought successfully against God? The majority of civilized nations have abolished Slavery! Have they fought successfully against God?

M. contends that God cursed the sons of Canaan, and put a black mark upon them that the world should know that whomsoever the Lord curses, he will curse! What arrant nonsense is this? Have not a majority of the slaves in the world been white? Where, then, is the mark of the curse? Are there not many colors—every shade, from white to black, and are not all, yes, every one, enslaved? How then can we know the accursed? The exhortation to servants or slaves to be obedient to their masters, is similar to the injunction to "be subject to the powers that be." Will any sane man, therefore, submit to all iniquities and oppressions of Government, under this command? Was our revolution criminal? The *spirit* of the rule only must be kept in view. Well, if God wills Slavery, according to M. till he thinks proper to change it, who can say but that he is now commencing the great work? Let M. take care lest he resist the will of God at *his own* hazard!

Such doctrines as held in this letter, and taught by learned Divines, makes God out the most merciless of tyrants, and fills our mad-houses with miserable lunatics!

RICHMOND, (KY.) April 2d, 1846.

MR. C. M. CLAY—Sir:—You surprise me to see you fighting against God—or do you expect to bless those whom God curses—or do you intend to alter or abolish the decrees of God at your will? When the old servant of God cursed his son Canaan, and told him that servants of servants he should be to his brethren; are you so presumptuous as not to be willing for the Lord's will to be done on earth as it is in Heaven? Why, Sir, he has put a black mark upon them, that all the world should know that whomsoever the Lord blesses he will bless, and whomsoever the Lord curses he will curse. And it is clear and plain that the Lord sanctions Slavery, for when he came upon the earth and found them slaves, he never forbade it, but told the servants to be subject to their masters in all things. Now, Sir, it appears clear and plain that God intends them to be slaves, until he changes or alters his decrees. Let any man deny it if he pleases—it will be at his own hazard. S. M.

C. M. CLAY.

Let Mammon hold while Mammon can,
The bones and blood of living man;
Let tyrants scorn while tyrants dare,
The shrieks and writhings of despair:
The end will come, it will not wait;
Bonds, yokes, and scourges have their date.
Slavery itself must pass away,
And be a tale of yesterday.

95

THE FREE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW ARGUS.

Glasgow. June 19, 1846.

SIR,—As your object is the dissemination of truth, and as the venerated name of Clarkson has been mentioned in the debate in the Assembly on Saturday, May 30, on slavery, where Dr. Candlish referred to him, and as his name has been repeatedly referred to on this subject, your love of fair play and of truth will lead you at once, I have no doubt, to insert the two following letters from him, which I respectfully request you to do. I may mention, that in my letters to him, I pointed out the distinction between slave-holding as an act and slavery as a system, and requested his opinion of the former. But there is enough in these letters to let every one see his meaning.—I am, Sir, yours truly,

JAMES MACBETH.

Letter from Thomas Clarkson, Esq. Letter I.

Playford-hall, near Ipswich, May 26, 1846.

SIR,—I received your letter yesterday, and am indeed quite shocked at its contents. I never expected to hear such language from the people of Glasgow, as that slavery is not a sin; from the people of Glasgow, I say, particularly, because they, beyond all others that I know of, have beheld slavery, to my knowledge, for fifty-five years, as not only a crime, but as the greatest of all crimes, and this has endeared them to me more than the inhabitants of any other city, Edinburgh excepted. I can assure you, Sir, for I speak after much sober thinking, that I cannot look at American slavery under any aspect whatever, numerous as are the aspects where we may see it, without pronouncing it to be a sin of the deepest die. Why did Moses punish the man-stealer with death (and all slave-holders are man-stealers), but that the theft of a man's liberty was greater than any other theft, and this theft is going on every day in America, wherever slavery exists? Is adultery no crime? In America it is carried on daily without remorse with the women slaves? Is rape a crime? It is in daily practice there. Is bearing false witness against another a crime? It would take me some time to show this from historical facts, and I have no time to spare. I could show that six out of the ten commandments are violated by slavery, not to mention the almost innumerable texts of scripture which make against slavery as a sin, such as doing directly contrary to another, directly the contrary of what we could wish to be done unto ourselves, such as withholding the wages or the reward of his labour from the labourer, &c. &c. No, Sir, I declare I cannot see slavery in any form or shape but I find sin there. But I am so ill, that I am tired even writing this little. I have now laboured, with but little intermission, for 61 years in this sacred cause, and if slavery be not a sin, I have been labouring to no purpose. I send you a little pamphlet, sent about six weeks ago to America; perhaps you may see in it some observation that is striking. All I can say now is, may God, in his infinite mercy—for I am sure that if in this case mercy is not wanted it is nowhere wanted—turn the hearts of your opponents, so as to give them right views of this subject.—I am, Sir, with every kind of feeling, yours truly,

THOMAS CLARKSON.

Letter II. June 16, 1846.

SIR,—I am at this moment very ill, and being 87 years of age, I do not expect to be here long. Your letter has greatly surprised me, when I am asked if slavery be a sin. Why, I conceive slavery to be a sin of the very deepest die. It is not simply a sin, but a complication of sins. Is theft a sin by the divine law? Is adultery a sin by the same standard? Is rape a sin? Is murder a sin? Let me now tell you that all these sins are perpetrated daily on the slave estates, without blushing, and with impunity, too,—for the master has the power by law to do what he will with the body of his slave. There is no appeal by any slave, however injured or even tortured, to any tribunal or individual.—There was a meeting lately in London, in a church which held 6000 people, on this subject, who to a man determined in our favour—not a dissentient voice in an assemblage of persons of all religious creeds. At parting, there was a universal shout—"Give up the money"—alluding to the Scotch Church. You may do what you please with my letters.—Yours truly, THOMAS CLARKSON.

CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY.

(From the Nonconformist.)

Outside the walls of Parliament there rages a controversy in which statesmen take no interest, but which involves principles of deeper moment, and looks on to consequences of broader magnitude, than many which claim and receive a much larger share of notice. The relation of the Free Church to slavery has recently come under debate in the General Assembly of that body—and the more general, but vastly more serious, inquiry has been anew mooted—whether slaveholding churches can be consistently recognised as churches of Christ. Drs Cunningham, Candlish, and Duncan have laboured hard to prove that they both can and ought—and by a train of special pleading which Christianity never needs, to substantiate a conclusion which, to our apprehension, the spirit of Christianity condemns.

On both sides, we venture to suggest, the true question for decision has been neglected, if not missed. On the one hand it is urged, and, as we think, irresistibly, that some sort of property in man existed in the apostolic churches, and that individuals holding slaves were by them recognised as true disciples of Christ. On the other hand it is contended, demonstratively, in our judgment, that slavery is a crime—and that by extending to its abettors the sanction of Christian communion with them, we make ourselves partakers of their guilt. The difficulty, if difficulty there be, will never be solved by attempting to destroy either of these positions. The facts cannot be annihilated by the reasoning—the reasoning is not necessarily upset by the facts. For our own part, we admit both—the first as true, the second as sound—and the conclusion at which we arrive, that slaveholders ought not to be received in communion as Christians, we reach by the path we are about to indicate. Whether that path be or be not a legitimate one, our readers will, of course, consider themselves free to judge.

The design of Christianity, then, we take to be mainly [and we think we are justified in adding, *exclusively*, spiritual. It is a discovery of truth vouchsafed for the one purpose of beneficially affecting man's moral relation to God. It aims, by a magnificent and touching display of the Divine character and purposes, to win over human hearts to essential rightness—to make them at one with Infinite Wisdom, Rectitude, and Benevolence. It is not a law, using that term in its strict acceptation, but a system of moral agency. It was not given as a mould into which men's actions are to be cast, but as a living germ, out of which men's actions are to be evolved. Hence, its few precepts are rather directive than mandatory, and are often pitched at such extremes as may serve rather to indicate the outermost limits to which a principle may range, than to present the special form in which it should be embodied. Its direct object, therefore, is to produce "an understanding heart" in relation to the Supreme—and, animated by the profoundest philosophy, it rightly calculates, that about this centre of gravitation all lesser relationships, responsibilities, and duties, will be compelled eventually to revolve.

If this be a true statement of the design of the gospel, it follows thence, that the ethics of Christianity, if we may be allowed the expression, require time and opportunity for complete development. In morals, a right state of the affections will be sure in the end to rectify grave mistakes of the judgment; but not immediately, nor intuitively—not without the aid of patient investigation, anxious siftings of the truth, opportunities for correct observation, and ample variety of experience. At the time of the apostles, many were the political and social questions about which men were universally in error—and the being in error in those days, argued not a rebellion of the heart against the authority of revelation, but merely that Christian truth had not all at once, as indeed it could not, consistently with the laws of mind, cleansed the judgment of that thick deposit of rubbish which preceding ages of ignorance had accumulated there. The clear stream had formed for itself a stream through the very midst of human impurities and follies—but the sweeping them all away was not destined to be the work of a single age, however remarkable for its piety—and we doubt not that amongst the most zealous Christians of that day, sentiments were entertained on more than one topic which we should pronounce to be diametrically opposed to the spirit of Christianity.

Slavery, in one or other of its hateful forms, had for ages enjoyed an undisputed footing in the world previously to the promulgation of the gospel. Its essential sinfulness had, probably, never been suspected. It is only in the clear light of those sublime truths which Christianity reveals—only as the mind of the Eternal respecting our being and destiny beams upon us—that we become aware of the hideous features of this social degradation. Nor even then, without some process of thought. Coincidence of mind and deed with slavery might long remain amongst Christians, simply because attention had not yet been awakened to the subject. This, as well as other questions, political despotism for example, slept under the deadening influence of custom. Then, as now, there were elemental principles in Christianity, capable of conducting inquiry to a sound conclusion. Then, as now, the epistle to Philemon pointed the way for enlightened philanthropy to walk. But events had not occurred to stir the inquiry—judgment moved mechanically on in its old rut—and Christians held their slaves, and churches communed with them, without once suspecting that the practice has its roots in principles which God unequivocally condemns. The time had not yet come for this to be made clear.

The state of the case, however, in the present day, is greatly altered. On such subjects as slavery, war, political equality, and the like—but especially on the first—Providence has summoned the minds of men to investigation and decision. The question is up, and cannot be evaded. Indecision becomes criminal. The error which serious reflection may disperse, once pointed out as error, must be severely, impartially, and with all the light afforded by the discoveries of revelation, submitted to the test. Discussed as the question has been, pressed as it is upon the conscience, and illustrated

so amply, so painfully, and, on the other hand, so happily by experience, indifference to it is criminal, and entire forgetfulness of it impossible. American slavery, unlike that of earlier times, represents not the defective application of righteous principles, not the unwitting mistake of an honest but inquiring mind, but the determination of a rebellious heart. Were it otherwise, free discussion would be not only permitted but welcomed—the violent defence of an admitted wrong would cease—and we should hear no more of the lawfulness of slaveholding insisted upon in the same breath with the accursed nature of slavery itself.

We should be sorry to affirm that an individual persisting in holding slaves cannot, under even present circumstances, be a Christian believer—but we do affirm, that he ought not to be openly recognised and accredited as such. True disciples may occasionally place themselves in a position so disgraceful, as to render suspension, if not excommunication, necessary. The great object of churches is to bear testimony to the truth—and, when they refuse to take account, not of speculative differences of faith, but of gross practical wrong, and give their sanction to "institutions" against which, as confessedly sinful, they are specially bound, for the truth's sake, to protest, they place themselves beyond the pale of ecclesiastical recognition. This, Dr Candlish will admit. He doubts the propriety of fraternising, even under the auspices of the Evangelical Alliance, with the residuary kirk of Scotland, fearful lest the Free Church in doing so would compromise her testimony against the sin of erastianism. But he can give hands of fellowship to slaveholders, receive their pecuniary aid, and plead ingeniously, if not successfully, in their defence. The old proverb of the gnat and the camel—the old text of mint, anise, and cummin, as opposed to righteousness, judgment, and mercy, receive a new illustration. American slaveholders are nearer to the mind of Christ, less actively opposed to the spirit of the gospel, in Dr Candlish's estimation, than are the men with whom he once associated, and whose sole difference with the leader of the Free Church is, that they remained on the spot from which he reluctantly departed.

We much regret the conclusion at which the three above-named doctors have arrived. We regret still more, but our sorrow is less mingled with surprise, the line of argument by which they sought to make that conclusion good. We regret most of all, but with no mixture of wonder, the insolent and acrimonious tone in which their arguments were put forth. Men suspecting themselves in the wrong always betray a soreness of temper. The talents of these gentlemen are above dispute—but we have always been astonished that Scotchmen should have placed confidence in their moral judgment. They have sailed too near the wind, on trying occasions, for us to embark with them. They will yet, we predict, be beaten—and, when the grace of concession is rendered impossible, they will, in obedience to what they are arrogant enough to call "the clamours of the mob"—"*send back the money.*"

CIVIC HONOURS.

"SEND BACK THE MONEY."

The Town Council have had another long debate on the propriety of presenting the freedom of the city to Mr George Thompson. While we perfectly agree with the principles contained in the resolutions submitted by the Lord Provost for the future guidance of the Council on this subject, yet on looking at the animus of the speeches delivered by Messrs Lothian and Russell and Thomson, we cannot but regard his Lordship and the Council as having put themselves in a most undignified position by bringing forward these resolutions at the present moment. If the Council did wrong in presenting the citizenship to Mr Thompson, it might have followed one of those numerous precedents furnished last year by the House of Commons of voting to-day and rescinding to-morrow, and which the members of our mimic Parliament have not been slow to imitate on questions between water companies and public trusts. But if it did right in securing Mr T. as a citizen (and the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants, including many Free Churchmen, believe so), it was most unhandsome in the Council as a body, and most humiliating to the members individually, thus to to brand themselves as reckless and unthinking partizans, at the bidding of some half-dozen of thick-and-thin supporters of the Free Church and one or two pragmatical Dissenters.

Nothing has appeared so prominently in the speeches of the laymen connected with the Free Church during this "send-back-the-money" controversy (in the meantime we put the ministers out of court, because, like Demetrius, they have their living by this way)—nothing has appeared so prominently, we say, as the great zeal which these gentlemen have displayed in bygone years on behalf of the slave, if their statements are entitled to credit. Sheriff Speirs, in the Free Assembly, begged to say a few words to keep himself right with the public, in consequence of the active part he had taken in the former anti-slavery movement; and of course it behoves Mr Lothian, and the other little lights, who, in the shape of expectant lawyers, flicker round the great legal luminary of the county of Mid-Lothian, to follow in the same track, and accordingly we find Mr Lothian in his flashy, pretty, milky speech on Tuesday commencing with

I think it right to premise that I have no sympathy with the system of slavery in any form. If I had Mr Thompson's eloquence, I am quite certain that I, at least with equal honesty, would denounce that system with all my powers, as worthy of all execration, and as one which infers an enormous amount of guilt, both against God and against man. If there lives a human being who can contribute in the smallest degree to put an end to that system, and who yet does not use his best exertion to do so, I believe he will have to answer to God for it. (Hear, hear, from Mr Stott.) I am stating no new opinion of mine. I remember in the days of my boyhood, that my heart used to swell with indignation as I thought on "slavery's sad abode;" and I feel and wish as intensely and as ardently as ever, that the days were come when the slave will no longer hear the oppressor's voice, nor dread the tyrant's rod.

Now it must be admitted, that, for flashiness, this completely outdoes the more modest statement of Mr Lothian's legal head—the Sheriff. But the statements of both of these gentlemen would lead the simple to believe that they had been toiling and sighing and crying for the slave's emancipation; that since the days of their boyhood—some thirty or forty years ago—they have been exerting their every energy on behalf of their "chattelized" brethren, and that, in this matter, "Scipio and Pompey very much alike—'specially Pompey." So they have, but in the wrong direction, for "we are not aware," to use the modest phraseology of Dr Candlish, that they ever tried to slake their burning zeal by becoming members of the Edinburgh or any other anti-slavery society, or even by contributing one penny to a fund for working out the emancipation of their brethren who were in bonds; and, if so, this is surely the nicest, easiest, most gentlemanly, most delicate, and least "offensive" method yet devised for liberating the slave from his cruel taskmaster. Such "action," however well adapted for the meridian of Free Church elders, their daughters, and their sons-in-law, who have become rich by the price of blood, will yet be held up to the execrations of an indignant world, and scowled at by religion and humanity as

> "A monster of such hideous mien,
> That to be hated needs but to be seen."

Another point on which the defenders of the Free Church have "pronounced" unanimously is, that Mr Thompson is *paid* for carrying on this anti-slavery agitation. From the editor of the *Witness* down to the fourpenny pamphleteer—from Drs Cuningham and Candlish down to Mr Lothian—this has been asserted in every variety of language and style "between the most reckless assertion and the lowest quibbling," as Mr L. elegantly puts it. Now he becomes "indignant" at the "professional and paid orator," and now he "*doubts*" as to the class for whom such honours are intended.

In addition to what I have stated, I must add, *tha I do not know* if he belongs to the class upon whom this honour ought to be conferred, because, as I understand, he is a professional and paid speaker. I do not know that the circumstance of a man being hired to conduct a public discussion marks him out for any particular reward, albeit the discussion in which he is employed is one which ought to receive the support of the public.

Neither do we know that the mere circumstance of a man being "hired," if done legitimately, makes either for or against his title to any particular reward. We suppose Mr Lothian will not deny that the Erskines, Broughams, Romillys, Denmans, Campbells, &c. &c., were "hired," just as he himself is "hired" by clients who, in many cases, succeed through such "hire" in making "the worse appear the better reason," (the only difference between him and those eminent statesmen being, that, while they practise in the courts above, he practises in the courts below.) Now, whatever may be thought of the occupation, we have never heard that he rejected the "hire." But we challenge Mr Lothian, Treasurer Thomson, or any other member of the Free Church, in or out of the Council, to show that Mr Thompson *is* a "paid orator" on this subject; and we do so with confidence, from what we know of his connection with the Anti-Corn Law League, when, like Cobden, Bright, Villiers, and others, he was the willing but unsalaried servant of the commercial and industrial freedom of his country. Yet this unblushing falsehood has been repeated from week to week and month to month by the members and ministers of this "pure" but "most abused church."

Mr Lothian's speech is altogether below even his standard of speechifying. Like the school boy with his *Euclid*, he goes over the whole ground, but pays no attention to the A's, the B's, the C's, and the D's of the question; and when he does venture on anything like argument, it is a mere translation of the well-worn and nearly cast-off dogmas of a scholastic and heartless theology into the sophistical though less-refined language of a legal mediocrity. But whatever opinion may be formed of Mr Lothian's "*version*," it will never be recommended as was Davanzati's Tacitus, because it contained fewer *words* than the original.

The only new "point" raised by Mr Lothian—if we except the little episodes on what did and what did not constitute the conduct of a gentleman—apppeared in his condemnation of Mr Thompson's "unmannerly rudeness" in having instructed Mr Buffum to collect information respecting the slaveholding character of those ministers and members in the Southern States, with whom the deputation had

such seasons of Christian fellowship. Here Mr Lothian's indignation is up to boiling point; and this, along with the facts which are every day coming to light, shews that Mr Thompson has touched a tender spot. These facts will come whether abolitionists bring them or not—the following being but a specimen of the doings of one of the SYNODS in fellowship as to "giving and receiving" with the Free Church:—

Extract from the *Savannah Republican*, a paper published in Savannah in the State of Georgia, dated March 31, 1845.

Will be sold, on the first Thursday in March, in front of the Court House, in the city of Darien, Georgia, between the legal hours of sale, the following negro slaves:—*i.e.*, Charles, Peggy, Antonett, Davy, September, Maria, Jenny, and Isaac, levied on as the property of Henry T. Hall, to satisfy a mortgage issued out of the M'Intosh Superior Court, in favour of the Board of Directors of the THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY of the SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA, against said Henry T. Hall.—Conditions, cash.

C. O'NEAL,
Deputy Sheriff, M.C.

Read this, ye dupes of metaphysical dreamers, and then say whether or not *your brethren* of the Synod of South Carolina know anything of the difference between slaveholders and slavehavers.

The conduct of Councillor Russell is not very intelligible. When the motion was originally made, he expressed his dissatisfaction with the proceedings of Mr Thompson with reference to the Free Church; nevertheless he voted that the freedom should be conferred. On Tuesday, however, he condemned the "claptrap" of "Thompson and his coadjutors," in language so abusive that he was interrupted by Whig, Tory, and Radical, with cries of "It's too bad—It's too bad."

He said—when interrupted, I was contrasting the calm and dignified conduct of Dr Cunningham with the sort of claptrap proceedings of the other party in connection with the promotion of their object. I submit whether or not the arguments employed by Dr Cunningham in the Free Church Assembly have ever been fairly met out of doors by Mr Thompson or his coadjutors. I do not subscribe wholly to the arguments of Dr Cunningham; but I do say that these arguments were deserving of the attention of Mr Thompson and his friends; and that they ought to have given attention to them, instead of indulging in language so abusive, so vituperative, as they have used against the Free Church.

We are not aware what meaning Mr Russell attaches to the word "claptrap," but we must remind him that it is the very expression applied by Drs Cunningham, Candlish, &c., to his epistles from the Calton Jail; and that although their pieces consisted in their bare *unaerstandings* and sour faces.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WITNESS.

SIR,—Something should surely be done in this red-hot weather in regard to the dogs running unmuzzled about the city. Some of our Commissioners of Police are very busy following the motions of certain rabid bipeds at present infesting our metropolis; but many of our citizens will agree with me in thinking, that not only would it be more apropriate work for them, if they looked after what may be proceeding from the mouths of our quadrupeds, but it would also have a great tendency to "emancipate" many white people from daily horrors if they did so. I hope our Commissioners of Police (for whom as a body I have the greatest respect), will not be lulled into security by the ungenial summers we have had for some years past, but will take immediate measures for enforcing the regulations regarding the muzzling of dogs at this season.—I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

A NERVOUS MAN.

Slavery, and the Slaveholders' Religion; as opposed to Christianity. By Samuel Brooke.

The author has sent us this valuable pamphlet, published at Cincinnati; its title is a sufficient index to its character. The book should be in the hands of every Abolitionist. It has a wide circulation at the West, and is doing much to open the eyes of the people to the character of American Christianity. We are requested to say that it will be for sale at the Annual Meeting of the American Society.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.—THE AMERICAN UNION RUSHING ON TO ITS DESTINY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW ARGUS.

Peaton Cottage, Roseneath, June 21, 1846.

SIR,—The following is a copy of a letter just received from that self-sacrificing Christian—that untiring, world-wide philanthropist, Wm. Lloyd Garrison—the man who led the way in the United States in the cause of immediate, unconditional abolition of slavery. If you can find room for it in the *Argus*, you would greatly oblige his numerous friends and fellow-labourers.

BOSTON, June 1st, 1846.

My Dear Brother,—Our New England Anti-Slavery Convention has just closed its sessions in "the old cradle of liberty," (Faneuil Hall;) and it has been the most numerously attended, the most spirited, the most earnest, the most radical, and the most auspicious and effective, of any of the series, (13 such annual Conventions have been held;) and this is bestowing upon it a splendid eulogy.

The present iniquitous war, in which this country is now engaged with plundered, stricken, inoffensive Mexico, was a prominent subject of discussion, and the boldest words were uttered against the American Government, and *loyalty to it was denounced as rebellion against God*. The excitement produced was so great, that Faneuil Hall was closed against us the last evening, lest there should be (as there would unquestionably have been) a mob! Of course, we shall turn this occurrence to good account. William Henry Channing and Theodore Parker distinguished themselves for the bravery of their language, and the revolutionary and "treasonable" doctrines which they enunciated. Never before have such meetings been held in this Commonwealth, or in this country. The pillars of the Government are falling. The foundations of existing institutions are shaking. Church and State are tottering to their overthrow. Multitudes are lifting up their

voices for a new Union, and a new Government, in which nothing oppressive shall enter. The times are stirring and eventful indeed. We are living years in days. Every moment is big with a sublime event. Let us remember that they only can be saved—they only be entitled to the crown—who endure unto the end. I feel as full of hope, faith, and strength, as my soul can hold. In the midst of all the commotion around me, MY PEACE IS LIKE A RIVER. My song continually is—"THE LORD REIGNETH, LET THE EARTH REJOICE."

Your recent grand meeting in Glasgow filled our Convention with joy and exultation, and its proceedings will deeply affect public sentiment throughout this country. Such blows never fall without a stunning effect. If "THAT BLOOD-STAINED MONEY" should be sent back to the South, it would produce an immense sensation here, and fall like an avalanche upon the slave system. The aid that it would give to our glorious Anti-Slavery movement cannot be estimated—certainly not overrated. I sincerely hope the Free Church WILL RETURN THE MONEY, make an unequivocal confession of wrong, and declare slaveholders to be totally unfit to belong to the "household of faith," or to be recognised as the children of God.

My time is so limited (to a few moments, for the mail leaves directly)—my heart is so full, that I shall fail in saying anything worth communicating on this sheet. As to the kind and brotherly invitation that has been given to me to visit Scotland this summer, I dare not say now that I will or can comply with it; but nothing would give me so much joy as to be able to do so. You shall know more definitely about it by the next steamer. It was cordially resolved, by the New England Convention, that I ought to go, in case my health will allow and I can make the necessary arrangements. How to leave my family, how to leave the Liberator, how to leave the country at the present great crisis, I do not know; but I know that I will consider the matter carefully, and that nothing but insuperable obstacles will induce me to say "nay" to the invitation. Still your expectations must not be too highly raised.

Heaven preserve your health, and grant us the privilege of soon embracing each other.—Ever yours,

Henry C. Wright. WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Sir,—May the people and Government of Great Britain and Ireland have their eyes open to see the certain course of events in that slave-holding Republic. Those who control the public press of this kingdom cannot be too vigilant in watching the movements of that nation, nor too minute or too earnest in exposing its spirit and its plans; for the destiny of that Republic, be it what it may, must deeply affect this nation for good or for evil. The following should be known and felt by every man and woman in this kingdom:—

Twenty years ago, Santa Anna, then the head of the Mexican nation, decreed the abolition of slavery throughout the whole nation. Not a foot of its territory was henceforth to be trodden by a slave. The United States have wrested from Mexico 300,000 square miles of her free territory, for the sole purpose of re-establishing slavery. The American Union, controlled by slaveholders, has waged war against Mexico, *solely* with a view to the final conquest of that country, in order to re-establish slavery there, and open new slave-markets for the slave-breeding States. Mexico will ultimately become a portion of the United States, and with all her productive silver and gold mines, and her soil of inexhaustible fertility, be subjected to the dominion of *Republican* slaveholders. Cuba will then be *annexed*. Then Hayti, then Jamaica, and all the British West India Islands, must be *annexed*, and again be fattened by the tears, the blood and bones of slaves. This is the plan, formed and avowed by the slaveocracy of the United States. That government gives to men political power and importance in proportion to the number of their slaves. The highest possible earthly motive is held out to the people of that Republic to extend and perpetuate the empire of slavery. Thus far they have been untiring in their efforts, and have succeeded in enlarging the boundary of slavery from 210,000 to one million of square miles of territory, and the number of slaves from 300,000 to three millions. All this within 50 years. Fifty years hence

they expect to wave the banner of that Republic over *twenty millions of slaves*.

What part is this kingdom to act in this war upon God and humanity? *Neutral*—it cannot be. You must, as a nation, be for or against it. Will you consent to see slavery re-established in Mexico, in Hayti, and in all the British Islands of the West? Whatever course this kingdom sees fit to take, the quicker it is decided upon and openly avowed, the better; for the slave-power is increasing in its demands and desires every day by your silence. One thing is certain, that, come what may to their reputation or their persons, the American Abolitionists, to a man, will stand openly arrayed against the United States Government in its guilty career of *Annexation*, as their robbery of Mexico is called. For this they will be denounced, arrested, imprisoned, condemned, mobbed, and executed, as *traitors*. But they must be traitors to a slave-holding, slave-breeding, slave-trading government, in order to be true to their allegiance to God and to humanity. Sure I am, if the people of this country could see the crisis which is at hand in that nation as we see it who have been for years engaged in the struggle against its oppressions—they would cease their apologies for American slaveholders, and cease to hold up the American Abolitionists to execration, as the leaders of the Free Church have done. But the coming five years will cover those leaders with shame and confusion, and call down upon them the frowns of outraged humanity, unless they repent of the wrongs which they have done to the American Bondman.

HENRY C. WRIGHT, from America.

A QUESTION FOR THE FREE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW ARGUS.

SIR,—On Thursday, 28th May last, the Rev. Mr. M'Kail, in addressing the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, stated "that he had received a sum of money for discharging the duty of chaplain to the garrison at Malta."

Mr. Campbell of Monzie took him to task for receiving chaplain's pay from a Government that also endowed Popery.

Mr. M'Naughtan did not think there was anything sinful in receiving money for services rendered, but as such an act was liable to be misrepresented, he thought all must admit it to be highly inexpedient, and "not in any way to be countenanced by the Church."

Dr. Candlish agreed with Mr. Campbell—"He believed it was inconsistent with their duty, inconsistent with their protest, and inconsistent with what they owed to the testimony they were called upon to bear to Popery, for any minister to receive a Government allowance. It appeared that this matter had been raised in a somewhat incidental manner, and he considered it to be a question that ought to be more deliberately disposed of than it was possible to do at that late hour and in that thin house. After some further remarks Dr. Candlish moved the appointment of a committee to draw up a deliverance, and to bring it before them at a subsequent diet," which motion was agreed to; and accordingly, on Tuesday following, the said committee "reported that it was their opinion, that ministers in foreign parts, connected with the Free Church, should abstain from receiving grants of public money for the discharge of ministerial functions." This also was "agreed to."

The Free Church cannot receive money from a government which endows what she considers a system of religious error, but she can receive money, and welcome to her pulpits, men who are denounced by the Apostle as MAN-STEALERS. But let that pass

The Free Church has discharged her ministers from receiving money at the hands of a Government which endows Popery—"it is liable to misrepresentation," "inconsistent with their duty, inconsistent with their protest, and inconsistent with what they owed to the testimony they were called upon to bear to Popery."—Dr. Candlish; see *Guardian*, 2d June. She has condemned Mr. M'Kail for receiving such remuneration, but has she SENT BACK THE MONEY?—Yours, &c. J. S.

THE FREE CHURCH AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The third meeting of the series was held on Monday evening, when every part of the Music Hall was crowded to excess; even the lobbies were filled, and immense numbers were disappointed in obtaining admission. Councillor Stott was again called to the chair. After a few introductory remarks, he called upon Mr Douglass to address the meeting.

Mr DOUGLASS rose amidst great applause. He said that he had great pleasure in again meeting with the citizens of Edinburgh, for the purpose of reconsidering a question which was now exciting so much attention. Ten days ago he received an invitation to attend one of the meetings of the British Anti-Slavery Society in London, when the connection of the Free Church with American slaveholders was brought forward by Mr Borwick, who referred to the United Secession Synod as having given up fellowship, and remonstrated with the slaveholding churches in America; at the same time he expressed a hope that the Free Church would take up the same noble position. When he sat down, Mr Chalmers, one of the deputation of the Free Church who went to the United States, rose and defended the conduct of the Free Church and the Christian character of American slaveholders. This brought the whole question before the meeting, and it was thoroughly discussed. The result was a unanimous decision by the whole meeting, that the blood-stained dollars should be sent back. There were persons there from all denominations, who held the Free Church of Scotland in the highest possible esteem in having so nobly seceded from the Established Church. There were also other meetings of a similar nature held in London. They (Mr D. and his coadjutors) were blamed for being the enemies of the Free Church—but, on the contrary, he believed that they were their best friends, for in calling upon them to return that money, they would perpetuate the existence of that church, and he was convinced that in so doing they had the confidence and support of the people of Scotland. The humanity of the world is against the slaveholders, and the church that will be in connection with them five years hence, will have lost its savour. If slaveholders are to be fellowshipped with as Christians, who may not? What reason can there then be for separating the robber and the adulterer? Is the slaveholder not guilty of the greatest crimes that man is capable of commiting, and is he not one of the greatest rebels against the government of Almighty God? There is not one single law in the Decalogue that is not violated by him. Well, then, if he may break every law of God and yet be fellowshipped with as a Christian, he would ask again who may not? He charged every slaveholder in the United States, no matter how high an authority in Christianity he may be, as being a legal brothel-keeper, for they had made the marriage relation a complete nonentity. Now if these men are to be the standard representatives of Jesus Christ in faith and virtue, who may not? It cannot be that the Free Church will continue this connection. He was certain that they must give it up. The Rev. Dr Campbell, of Finsbury Chapel, a zealous friend and great admirer of the Free Church, at the conclusion of one of the meetings held in London, gave three hearty cheers to send back the money. He (Mr Douglass) was also at a meeting of the British Temperance Society in Exeter Hall, on which occasion Joseph Sturge stood up to make a resolution for an assembly of the World's Convention, to meet in London, on the temperance question. To further that object he had promised a donation of £50, upon the condition, however, that no slaveholder was to be admitted to that meeting. He (Mr Douglass) thought this a very extreme measure; but, upon reflection, he came to the conclusion that Mr Sturge had a right to choose his own company. Mr Douglass sat down amidst great applause.

Mr GEORGE THOMPSON rose, and, after referring to recent proceedings in London, stated, that there had that day been placed in the hands of the Moderator of the Assembly of the Free Church, an address from the committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, from which he would read the concluding paragraph :—" The committee feel it to be their solemn duty to protest against the proposition that slaveholders, whatever their professions or pretensions, are fit and proper persons to be admitted to the sacred fellowship of the Christian church ; and they would earnestly implore you, gentlemen, as the representatives of an influential and important branch of that church, to give forth your testimony to that effect ; and, by way of giving emphasis to that testimony, to restore the money which in an evil hour your commissioners were induced to receive from the hands of slaveholders. Gentlemen, had these slaveholders presented to your representatives slaves instead of money, they would have indignantly refused the gift. Yet the money which they received, may have represented, in some instances, the value of men, women, and children, who had been cruelly deprived of their liberty ; or, at all events, the value of their uncompensated toil, a toil wrung from them by the fear of the torture of the whip. Such money comes not with a blessing, but a curse. They would therefore hope that not one farthing of it will ever be allowed to be appropriated to the purposes of the Free Church." (Loud cheers followed the reading of this passage.) Since he (Mr Thompson) had been absent, a certain pamphlet had made its appearance : —(hear, hear)—an anonymous pamphlet. Why anonymous ? Was the writer ashamed of it ? (Cheers.) But perhaps it was not correct to say *writer*, since the document bore the signs of being the work, not of one, but many hands. He thought he could discern, not only the hand of Esau, but the voice of Jacob. (Laughter) He would have been justified in treating this pamphlet with silence, in consequence of the secrecy of the writer ; but it was convenient, if not necessary, and incumbent upon him, to answer it. On the present occasion, he should dispose of certain parts of this production, and leave the remainder to be noticed and disposed of on another evening. The writer, though full of complaints against him (Mr T.) for the use of unauthorised epithets, and the imputation of improper motives, had not himself avoided the use of such weapons. For instance, he had called him (Mr T.) an " itinerant orator ;" had accused him of " putting on insinuating looks ;" of " assuming indignant frowns ;" of employing contemptible " arts ;" in fact, of playing the hypocrite, while he appeared to be indignant at the conduct of the Free Church. These things he should pass over without further notice, and at once proceed to show, that the author of the pamphlet had founded much of what he had written upon statements which were wholly at variance with the truth. He would not impute intentional falsehood, but satisfy himself with pointing out the gross misstatements by which the production before him was disfigured. On page 6, were the following words :—" You assert that, as no slaveholder *can* be a Christian, so *all* slaveholders ought to be summarily excommunicated as heathens, and handed over to Satan ; and you denounce all who refuse to take or act upon that view as 'sanctioning slavery,' and as the 'enemies of the slave.'" I deny, said Mr Thompson, that I ever asserted anything of the kind. I have never used the word " excommunication ;" it is a word I abhor. I have never said that all slaveholders ought to be handed over to Satan. I will repeat, however, what I have before said, namely—that certain leading members of the Free Church did, in 1835, give to the people of Scotland a book, in which the following passage occurs :—" *Every slaveholder, peremptorily and without delay, must be excommunicated from the church of God.* It is of no importance, what titles, what office, what station, or what rank the

slaveholder may hold, or what apparent virtues or talents he may possess and develope. To all these specious pleas, and to all his anti-christian white-washing, there is a concise, significant, and irrefutable reply—*He is a man-stealer!* But as a manstealer is the very highest criminal in the judgment of God, and of all rational uncorrupted men, he cannot be a Christian; and, therefore, it is an insult to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, to record the most notorious criminal as an acceptable member of 'the household of faith.'" Such is the language of a book, which Dr Cunningham, and others now in the Free Church, caused to be printed for the information of the religious people of Scotland, and recommended as worthy their special consideration. In the same book, too, is the deliberate judgment of the General Assembly of the United States in the year 1794 to the following effect:—"1 Tim. i. 10, The law is made for man stealers. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment—Exodus xxi. 15; and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or *in retaining them in it*" If, then, slaveholders have been declared deserving of excommunication, it is not by me, but by the General Assembly of their own church, and by Dr Cunningham and his colleagues, who have adopted and given currency to the doctrines I have now quoted. (Cheers.) This writer, after asserting the fact, that there were slaveholders in the primitive Christian churches, goes on to say (p. 7):—"That the practice of the primitive church was as stated above, admits, I believe, of the strongest and most irrefragable proof. Indeed, it *is only within the last few years that the fact has been challenged.* Certain of the abolitionists of America were the first to discover the opposite; but so clearly did they find the case made out against them, that, as I am informed, those of them who have not already turned infidel, have been compelled to abandon the ground which they so rashly assumed, and granting the fact of the admission of slaveholders to the primitive church, now urge their plea for the excommunication of the slaveholders of the south on the much more plausible and promising ground of the difference of times and circumstances." Sir, I altogether deny that the fact here alleged is proved; on the contrary, I have maintained, and do still maintain, that the spirit of Christianity, and the precepts of the apostles, are utterly irreconcilable with slaveholding, which is declared by the General Assembly to be man stealing, according to the true interpretation of Timothy. I shall not debate this point now. I cite this passage for the purpose of denying that the doctrine which this writer is here disputing was discovered by certain modern abolitionists. The passage I have read from the Assembly's Catechism proves this. No modern abolitionist has ever written or spoken anything stronger than is there declared in the canons of their own church. But I will refer to another authority. I hold in my hand a sermon preached by the truly great Dr Jonathan Edwards in 1791. This profound and holy man says:—"No man has a better right to retain his negro in slavery, than he had to take him from his native African shores. And every man who cannot show, that his negro hath by his voluntary conduct forfeited his liberty, is obligated immediately to manumit him." He further says:—"I presume it will not be denied, that to commit theft or robbery every day of a man's life, is as great a sin as to commit fornication in one instance. But to steal a man or to rob him of his liberty is a greater sin, than to steal his property, or to take it by violence. And to hold a man in a state of slavery, who has a right to his liberty, is to be every day guilty of robbing him of his liberty, or of manstealing." Now, Sir, in reference to the first passage, I presume no member of the Free Church will attempt to argue, that the negro in America has, "by his voluntary conduct, forfeited his liberty;" and if

109

he has not, then, according to Jonathan Edwards, the [illegible] who holds him as a slave is "obligated immediately [illegible] manumit him." In the last passage, this eminent divi[illegible] declares that the slaveholder is "every day guilty of ma[illegible] stealing." This is the discovery of a man, reverence[illegible] wherever Protestant Christianity is loved—especially i[illegible] this country; and was borne fifty-five years ago, lon[illegible] before the majority of modern abolitionists were born. (Cheers.) Equally destitute of truth is the assertion, tha[illegible] the ground originally assumed by abolitionists has bee[illegible] abandoned. I stand astonished at the hardihood of the assertion. The fact, known to all who are familiar with the anti-slavery movement in America, is, that for more than ten years the Christians of the free states of America have been steadily advancing towards the position that slaveholders—or, as the General Assembly and Jonathan Edwards denominate them, "manstealers"—should not be admitted to Christian fellowship. I will give you the most recent proof of this. On the day that I received this pamphlet by post in London, I also received some American newspapers. In the pamphlet I read the passage I have quoted. In the first paper I opened, I read the doings of the New England Conference of Episcopal Methodists, held only last month. Let me show you the ground taken by that body, and ask you to compare it with the Free Church deliverance of last year, and with the assertion in this pamphlet. What I am about to read, is the deliberate judgment of a very large and highly respectable body of most orthodox Christians. It is as follows:—"ON ANTI-SLAVERY. In the II Section, VII Article of Religion in our Discipline, is the following language: 'Those two great commandments, which require us [illegible] love the Lord our God with all our hearts and our neig[illegible] bour as ourselves, contain the sum of the divine law as [illegible] is revealed in the Scriptures, and are the measure a[illegible] perfect rule of human duty, as well for the ordering an[illegible] directing of families and nations, and all other socia[illegible] bodies, as for individual acts, by which we are require[illegible] to acknowledge God as our supreme ruler, and all me[illegible] as created by him equal in all natural rights. Therefore, all men are bound so to order all their individual and social acts, as to render to God entire and absolute obedience, and to secure to all men the enjoyment of every natural right, as well as to promote the greatest happiness of each in the possession and exercise of such rights.' Consistent with this, we have adopted as a test of membership, a rule with others, which prohibits 'the buying or selling of men, women, or children, with an intention to enslave them, or holding them as slaves, or *claiming that it is right so to do.*'" Now, Sir, I would have those who hear me take special notice of the last words in this document. Not only is *holding* slaves made a test of membership, but the "*claiming that it is right to do so,*" is also a test; hence this body repudiates Christian fellowship with those of the Free Church who assert that the relation of master and slave may lawfully exist. What now becomes of the assertion, that the ground taken by certain abolitionists has been abandoned? (Cheers.) Before I dismiss this subject, I would quote a passage from a sermon delivered within the last few weeks, by the Rev. Albert Barnes of Philadelphia—a name well known and justly esteemed among the Christian churches of this country. (Cheers.) He is a Presbyterian. What does he say?—"Let all evangelical denominations but follow the simple example of the Quakers in this country, and slavery would soon come to an end. There is not vital energy enough—there is not power of influence and numbers enough *out of the church* to sustain it. Let every religious denomination in the land *detach itself* from all connection with slavery, without saying a word against others; let the time come when in all the mighty denominations of Christians, it can be announced that *the evil has ceased with them for ever;* and let the voice of each denomination be lifted up in kind but firm and solem[illegible]

testimony against the system—with no 'mealy' words; with no attempt at apology; with no effort to throw the sacred shield of religion over so great an evil, and the work is done. There is no public sentiment in this land—there could be none created—that would resist such a testimony; there is no power *out* of the Church that could sustain slavery an hour if it were not sustained IN it." In regard to the pamphleteer's information respecting the infidelity of abolitionists, I will only say that I deny it, and recommend him to learn more and write less on the subject, lest he, too, should come under the condemnation which he so boldly bestows upon others, whom he accuses of transgressing the ninth commandment. (Cheers.) The assertion, that the majority of technical abolitionists at the north are like the majority of the slaveholders of the south, without even a profession of religion, is one which I can only state to be an untruth. This denial I make, with a long and intimate acquaintance with the growth and present state of the anti-slavery cause at the north; and I unhesitatingly declare, that the vast majority of those who actively assist the abolition movement are not only professing Christians, but men and women, who, in their daily walk and conversation, are unblameable, and are the finest and purest specimens of the piety of the free states. And yet this masked writer libels them by putting them on a level with the non-professing slaveholders of the southern states. (Cheers.) I am accused of coming to Edinburgh "with the view of injuring the Free Church." Now, Sir, this writer professes to have heard me when I spoke in Rose Street. I appeal to those here, who also heard me on that occasion; and I ask, if I did not, at the commencement of my address, express my deep sorrow at finding myself opposed to the proceedings of a church whose struggles I had witnessed with sympathy and admiration, and whose conduct, save in this matter, I regarded as noble and praiseworthy. (Cheers.) Surely this writer is not the man who can consistently accuse me of bearing false witness, when he can thus impute to me a motive which I, not only on that occasion, but on every subsequent occasion, most emphatically disclaimed. I will not brand such conduct as it merits—I leave those who hear me to do that; but I once more solemnly deny the charge brought against me, and assert that I desire most earnestly the peace, the prosperity, the purity, and the usefulness of the Free Church; and deem myself not the enemy, but the friend of that church, when I fearlessly point out the error into which she has been betrayed, and the danger which threatens her, if she refuses to retrace her steps. (Cheers.) He is the enemy of the Free Church who has linked her to slavery. He is her enemy who defends the conduct of him who has done this. He is the enemy of the Free Church who would prevent her from returning to the right path. Happy would it be for that church if all such men were put out of her bosom. (Cheers.) On the 12th page of the pamphlet I find these words:—"You have asserted, strongly and repeatedly, that this is the *first* occasion on which the lawfulness of admitting slaveholders to church fellowship has been defended in this country, and that to the Free Church alone belong the shame and guilt of defending it. 'In all former discussions,' you said on Wednesday evening, 'it was taken for granted that a slaveholder and disciple of Christ could not exist in the same person.' And you added, that the Free Church had also disgraced itself by doing what no other church in this country had ever done—and which it was unlawful to do—viz., by taking into its treasury the money of slaveholders." Now, Sir, having read this passage, I deliberately affirm that I never, either here or elsewhere, even made one of the assertions attributed to me. The whole passage is a fabrication—a pure invention and forgery. I solemnly affirm that I have never said any-

thing which would bear such a construction. To have said what is here palmed upon the world as mine, would have been the height of folly as well as of mendacity. I know no man capable of doing so, but the writer of this false and unfounded pamphlet. I more than once stated, that while all other Christians in Great Britain were withdrawing from fellowship with slaveholders, the Free Church of Scotland, to her shame and disgrace, sent a deputation to America, to welcome slaveholders to her communion; and not only so, but, at the expense of fidelity and truth, and sympathy with the slave, took the profits of oppression and plunder and slavery, and placed them in her treasury. That she did this at a time when the rest of the Christian world had learnt to abominate manstealers, and finding their remonstrances without effect, had resolved to withdraw from intercourse and Christian friendship with such men. I stated and still declare that such conduct on the part of the Free Protesting Church of Scotland was wrong—was an apology for slavery—was a sentence of condemnation upon every body that had ceased its intercourse with slaveholders—was a practical acknowledgment of the lawfulness of slavery—and a practical abandonment of the cause of the slave. I stated, what I again declare upon the testimony of her delegates, that she did this for the sake of money. For filthy lucre, her delegates were dumb—for filthy lucre's sake they sat in an assembly, in which, to use their own words, "the question of slavery was *tabooed*"—in which they could only sit, on condition that they were ignominiously silent on the subject of the most stupendous abomination in the world—an abomination upheld, greedily, by the very men by whom they were surrounded. All this I have stated, and now state again. With one hand they held open the door of Free Church communion, and with the other received three thousand pounds, as the bribe for the admission of manstealers into the sanctuary of freedom, in the land of John Knox. (Loud cheers.) Let the pamphleteer make what he pleases of this. In the meantime I deny every word I have now quoted:—"You assert that this is the first occasion on which the money of slaveholders—'the price of blood,' as you call it—has been received in this country for religious purposes, and you call upon the Free Church to send it back." The only part of this passage which is true is the last. I do call upon the Free Church to send back the money, but utterly deny the rest. All that is written upon the subject therefore goes for nothing, as far as I am concerned. There is one circumstance, however, noticed by this writer in connection with his own false statements which is worth noticing. He quotes an instance of money being received from slaveholders by the Scottish Missionary Society, and refers to an address of that Society in 1823. "Two West India proprietors have just made offers of pecuniary aid to this Society, that the means of religious instruction may be sent to their estates, the united population of which amounts to above seven hundred souls. This circumstance we announce with the *utmost satisfaction*. It displays the growth of *a liberal and Christian spirit* among those who have the destinies of so many of their fellow-creatures placed at their disposal, and is calculated to change the sentiments of such as, either at home or abroad, with undefined dread of latent evils, have hitherto objected to the religious instruction of the slaves." Now look at this passage. Here the Society receives money from the masters that religious teachers may be sent to their slaves, while the Free Church takes money from masters who keep their slaves in heathen darkness, that that Church may increase the light of the Gospel in Scotland. (Cheers.) Though the Free Church has taken £3000 from the slaveholders of America, that church dare not put a Bible into the hands of one of the slaves belonging to those masters. (Cheers.) "You yourself have asserted that none of the American churches which refuses to make slaveholding a

test of communion is a church of Christ:' This assertion is utterly false, and the seven pages which are written about it therefore go for nothing. I never said that which is attributed to me. I defy the writer of the pamphlet to lay his fingers upon a word of mine in print that will bear any such an interpretation. I have always discriminated between slaveholding and other churches, and have never asserted or insinuated that a church in America could not be a church of Christ unless slaveholding was made a test of communion. I have highly commended the churches that adopted such a test, as acting both more consistently and more effectually upon the question of slavery, but I have never unchristianized the churches that did not set up such a test. What would the writer of this pamphlet say of me, were I to act by him as he has done by me? Let me refer to another passage in this pamphlet to show the unscrupulous falsehood of the author. "American ministers are the special objects of your wrath; and the epithets quoted above express, I suppose, the idea usually entertained, or at least the character usually given of them, by the abolitionists of America. On this point, also, there is strong and overwhelming testimony. I might, of course, refer to the names of many illustrious members of the American churches. I might name Dr Hodge, Dr Alexander, Dr Beecher, Dr Wayland, Dr Spring, Dr Sprague, Dr Leonard Bacon, and a host besides—all of them men who would do honour to any church, but whom Mr Wright denounces as 'consecrated villains,' and whom you would exclude from Christian fellowship." This passage is full of falsehood. American ministers have never been the objects, still less the *special* objects of my wrath. I have never named one of the men here spoken of disrespectfully, I have never once introduced them into this controversy, I have never hinted at their being excluded from Christian fellowship, or dreamed of doing so. This is my answer to this falsehood. Again: I am accused of attributing to Mr Lewis a preface to a pamphlet containing extracts from his work. Now the report of my speech was made out before this charge appeared in print. Here is the report unaltered. Let us see if the charge be true. At Rose Street I said—"Within a few hours of coming to the house, I have, as John Bunyan would have said, "lighted upon a certain pamphlet, made up of extracts from a book written by one of the Free Church delegates to the United States—the Rev. George Lewis of Dundee. To that pamphlet is affixed a preface, which I will also make the preface to my speech, and the ground-work of some remarks. This I consider both just and necessary, as my friends before you are implicated in the charges here made, as well as the characters of those who are not present to defend themselves against their calumniators. I will read this precious and *anonymous* specimen of Free Church clerical vilification, sentence by sentence, and give my answers to each." Here I distinctly state that the preface is anonymous. (Cheers.) Here is another extract from the same report of my speech:—"I know not how to reply to this unsupported, scandalous, and wicked calumny. Here are no names, no quotations, no references, but a sweeping assertion that those who occupy the more prominent positions in the American Anti-Slavery Society are the enemies of Christianity, of social order, and of public morality! Come forth, thou nameless accuser of the brethren! (Loud cheers.) Come forth, I say! I publicly charge thee with falsehood of the blackest kind;—I challenge thee to support these imputations;—I defy thee to name the parties who deserve them." Did I know thee, I would brand thee to thy teeth, with forming, in ignorance or malice, a baseless and atrocious libel against the truest and the best of men. Come forth, thou moral scavenger! and then—

> 'Thy name—thy human name—shall hang on high,
> Exalted 'midst thy less abhorred compeers,
> To fester through the infamy of years.'"

Let me now refer to another gross, I hope however not wilful, misstatement. In one of my recent addresses I applied the word Jesuitical to a document ascribed to Dr Candlish, whereupon the writer of this pamphlet says:—"How does it come to pass that *you* use the word 'Jesuitical' as a term of *reproach*, while it is a fact that when in India, *you attended the examination of a Jesuit college* there—and at its close delivered one of your 'eloquent' speeches, in which you declared your *great delight* at what you had witnessed, and your confidence that by the spread of such institutions India could be regenerated? *Do you remember this?*" My answer is, I do not remember this. I never attended the examination of any Jesuit college in India. (Cheers.) I never expressed my confidence that by the spread of such institutions as Jesuit colleges India would be regenerated. I once attended, in company with a considerable number of the most influential persons in Calcutta, the opening of a school founded by a native gentleman, in which instruction was to be in part given by some of the teachers and professors in the Jesuitical college; but in that school *all religious instruction was entirely prohibited*, and the knowledge imparted confined entirely to other subjects. (Cheers.) It was not a Jesuit college, but a native school, with which the Jesuits at this time have nothing to do—(cheers)—and while they had to do with it, they were entirely prohibited from imparting any education on the subject of religion. The statement in this pamphlet is a totally inaccurate one, which the writer, if he be honest, will hasten to retract. Another falsehood is, that I compared Mr Garrison to Jesus of Nazereth. I will read what I said of this gentleman. I quote from a speech made at Glasgow, which contains nearly word for word what I said at Rose Street. I utterly deny that I said of Mr Garrison or any other person more than is here given:—"Sir, let me once again bear my testimony to the character of William Lloyd Garrison. I have known him for thirteen years. During that time I have studied him deeply. I have seen his soul in his writings. I have seen it poured out in the fullness of confidential correspondence—I have seen it manifested in the hours when a man throws off the disguises he is wont at other times to assume, and appears as he really is—I have seen him in the every-day labours of life—I have seen him in the time of danger, when his life was in peril, and in the season of prosperity, when the people shouted Hosannah. I have conversed with him on matters of deepest importance relating both to time and eternity, and have enjoyed, I believe, his unlimited confidence. I have heard the accusations of his enemies, and have investigated both them and the motives in which they originated. I may therefore ask to be admitted a witness, and my solemn, my heartfelt conviction and unbiassed testimony is this, that there breathes not a man more worthy the love, the trust, and the esteem of the friends of God and man than William Garrison." I will cite one more falsehood from this pamphlet, and then have done for the present. This malicious libeller says:—"*Your assertion that* although you know the leading abolitionists of America well—although you have lived with them, travelled with them, conversed with them, and although they have often poured out their whole souls to you—*you never heard them express a single sentiment on the subject of religion, of which you could in the least disapprove*, proves certainly one of two things—either that, after all, you do not know the religious views of these men so fully or so accurately as do some who never saw an American abolitionist in the flesh, or, which is more likely, that your own religious views are as defective and heretical as theirs." My answer to this is, I never said what is here set down, and that I never said so of any set of men in the world. The passage is false, and I defy the author to prove its truth. I find in this pamphlet many references to the work of Messrs Reed

and Matheson, who were once a deputation to the United States of America. I find, too, that the *Scottish Guardian* and other leading journals of the Free Church party are abusing me for speaking harshly of the American churches. Let me, therefore, quote the sentiments published in the *Church of Scotland Magazine* and the *Scottish Guardian* in 1836:—

(From the Church of Scotland Magazine.)

"The Cumberland Presbyterians of America.—We have not for some time directed the attention of our readers to the sad religious condition of voluntary America—partly because we have made so thorough an exposure of the false arguments drawn from this field already, and partly because our friend, Mr George Thompson, anti-slavery lecturer, is doing the work so excellently for us, and that in quarters where we would not be listened to with much candour. We return that gentleman our warmest thanks for his services, and especially for the well-directed stroke by which he demolished the broken credit of the time-serving deputies—Drs Reed and Matheson. Ministers of the gospel who could act as they acted in the matter of slavery in the United States where it was necessary to please the slaveloving Christians with whom they associated, cannot be accounted very trustworthy in detailing the praises of voluntaryism, when it is equally necessary to please its friends and advocates at home."

Extract from a Letter, signed "Observer," in the *Scottish Guardian* of 10th May 1836 giving an account of Meeting of the Congregational Union for Scotland in Edinburgh on the 5th May:—

"The meeting was informed that the English Congregational Board, among their great doings, were publishing a second edition of *Reed's Narrative of a Visit to the American Churches*—which, it was hoped, would meet with a better reception than the first. This led to the assertion that the cause of religion in America had been misrepresented in this country (of course by the Established party); but the withering exposure which Mr George Thompson of the Anti-Slavery Society, soon after made of the slaveholding, slavedealing voluntary ministers of America, showed that the misrepresentation is all on the side of the Congregationalists and their deputies." Again from same letter:—"Dr Wardlaw of Glasgow brought forward a series of well written, excellent resolutions on the subject of American slavery. The lion of the evening then appeared in the person of Mr George Thompson, who addressed the meeting for an hour, in a powerful and eloquent speech, in which, not the American world, but the *American church* was most fearfully exposed. The audience frequently could not restrain themselves from hissing the American Christians with indignation, and such remarks could be overheard as 'such Christians,' and 'voluntary Christians!' I thought I could see the expression of deep mortification in the countenances of the ministers on the platform, who had in various ways, during the evening, been dealing in the praise of voluntaryism, when one infernal picture after another was presented of the moral and religious character of their voluntary brethren across the Atlantic, in the very land whither they are ever pointing for the proof of the success of their New Testament principles. It would be impossible to relate the hundredth part of Mr Thompson's awful disclosures, and it is less necessary, as he stated that the documents would be published. Suffice it to say, that Christian churches sell their own members—that throughout the slave states (which are one-half of the whole) chastity is unknown in Christian families—and that at Nashville, a young man who was selling cottage Bibles to help him out with his education, was, for the awful offence of possessing two anti-slavery tracts, immediately taken, tried late on a Saturday evening, condemned within half an hour of the Sabbath morning, dragged to

the street, stripped, and publicly lashed by the public executioner; not less than seven of the jurymen who condemned him were Presbyterian elders, one a Presbyterian minister who had sat with him at the Lord's table the Sabbath before!! And such an atrocious deed called forth no sympathy or indignation among the multitudes who were its witnesses. Nay, there was disappointment that the punishment was not more severe. Some of the self-constituted jury voted for DEATH!! No wonder that the voluntaries of Britain are ashamed of the voluntaries of America, and are sending out expostulations and remonstrances. Such proceedings are sufficient to ruin any cause."

In conclusion, Mr Thompson stated that he had never held but one view on the subject, and had said no more of the deputation of the Free Church than of those sent by other religious bodies. Mr Thompson concluded amidst loud cheers.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

The Music Hall was again the scene of a crowded and attentive audience. Messrs Thompson and Douglass, as on the preceding evening, addressed the meeting.

Mr DOUGLAS commenced by exonerating himself and his brother abolitonists from the charge of coarseness in this discussion, alleging that there was much more to be found in the Free Church publications against them. He next proceeded to answer the question at great length, why he came to this city to speak on the subject of slavery. He was here because slavery was the common enemy to mankind. He was here because the slave in the United States was a brother of the human family. He was here because slavery in America was a fraud. He was here to invoke the moral sense of Scotland against the sytem. He was here because the moral influence of this country gave shape to the moral and religious institutions of America. He was here because the quick transmission by steam of the published public opinion on every question had an universal influence on the public mind in the United States. He was here because the slaveholders will not come to the light of truth, that their deeds of darkness may be reproved. And, lastly, he was here because the slaveholders did not want him here. (Much cheering.) In the course of illustrating these various points in his speech, Mr Douglass said that an attempt had been recently made by some of the leaders of the Free Church to show, that the relation in which they now stood with the slaveholders was one not of fellowship but of friendly correspondence; a change of the issue which he characterised as absolutely mean towards the slaveholders; but even this he was against, for what communion had Christ with Belial. (Mr Douglass was listened to throughout his long and interesting speech with great attention; the audience frequently testifying their approbation by hearty rounds of applause.)

At this juncture the Chairman invited to the platform any opponent, whether Free Churchman or otherwise, to discuss the question at issue with his friends around him, and he would ensure him a patient hearing; whereupon

Mr JOHN ORR 31 Broughton Street made his appearance. He said he was the son of a slaveholder, but for all that he did not justify slavery, yet he did not approve of the present measures for its abolition, for so long as it was the law of the land, the slaveholder could not avoid being what he was, neither could they abolish the evil by attacking him in the manner that was done by abolitionists. They must go to the legislature of the United States, and seek for

the abolition of Slavery. This gentleman in the course of his address also denied that the present slaveholder were manstealers; it was their fathers who under British rule got the slaves stolen from Africa, and the sons just naturally came into the possession of them, they could not help themselves until the law abrogated the system. (This gentleman's statements were received with groans and hisses; he was heard throughout with much impatience by the audience, who frequently interrupted him by cries of "Put him down," "Put him out.")

Mr THOMPSON then rose amidst much applause, and replied at great length to the statements of the preceding speaker. He said that the strange doctrine they had heard to-night was destructive of the law of God and human rights. It was unfortunate that the gentleman had told them he was the son of a slaveholder. He had held on to the *property* his father had left him until he could hold it no longer. The slaves were emancipated, but not by him. He received compensation money, and he ought to return the money, as it belonged to the emancipated negro. Mr Thompson exposed in a very eloquent and striking manner the hollowness of the gentleman's argument that slaveholders were not manstealers. He threw the blame of stealing upon the original kidnapper; but, said Mr T., no lapse of time can sanction wrong. His father knew that the slaves were stolen; the men that went to Africa to steal knew that they were committing a crime, and they certainly would never have done so had there been no slaveholder to receive the slaves; and there ever will be slaves so long as there are sons to inherit them. Although their fathers stole them, their sons keep the stolen property, and many say the latter are worse than the former, that the receiver is worse than the thief. (Great applause.) Mr Thompson then exposed the fallacy of Government interference with the principle of liberty inherent in the breast of every man. It was utterly beyond the power of any Government — nay, were all the crowned heads in Christendom to league together, they could not reduce one man to the condition of a slave; were all the priests in existence to come to counsel together and attempt to enslave a man, all their decisions to that effect would be in opposition to the law of God, "who has made of one blood all the kindreds of the earth," "ye all are brethren, deal not." (Cheers.) Mr Thompson next showed that although the slave was degraded to the condition of being the property of his fellowmen, still he was a man. It is not the ermine robe that makes the man —it is the image and superscription of God stamped upon the soul that declares his humanity; render unto God therefore the thing which belongs to God. Mr Orr, said Mr Thompson, professes great respect for laws spiritual and temporal; let him go and preach that doctrine to the Free Church, who would not submit to the law on one occasion, for (said they) it was in opposition to the law of God. (Immense cheering.)

Mr ORR then rose again and claimed a hearing, but his voice was drowned in groans and hisses, so that he could scarcely be heard. He said something about Mr Thompson not being a doctor of divinity, and therefore he could not hear him expound from the Scriptures the doctrine of the equality of mankind. He had been called upon to send back the compensation money, but it did not fall to his lot to receive it, and therefore he could not send any back. (The gentleman was again interrupted by cries of

"Sit down," which he eventually did amidst a storm of hissing.)

The CHAIRMAN then stated that if there was any minister or member of the Free Church, or any other church, who was prepared to oppose what had been stated, he would now be heard. After waiting a few minutes, none appeared, and

Mr THOMPSON resumed—He said he was afraid they were not going to find one. He should like to have had an opponent on this question. He should like him to have been a man of talent and erudition, and learned in the law; some of those, for instance, who are in the Free Church Assembly at present, who deem it necessary in the corner of the streets, in the drawing-room, and other convenient places, to combat our views. Let them meet us face to face. When we are gone, they would no doubt shoot after us their Parthian arrows. We shall then, perhaps, hear of another pamphlet; but let them remember that we challenged every one of them, more especially Dr Cunningham, to meet and debate on the question at issue. Should they agree to do so after he left, he would come 400 miles to meet them. (Applause.) He then reverted to the pamphlet, more for this reason, he said, than any other, because it was universally applauded by the Free Church organs as completely expressing their views on the subject. But it is absolutely false from beginning to end. He defied the writer of that pamphlet to prove the statements therein ascribed to him. Not one word of it is true; it is in every respect a complete misrepresentation and a forgery. Not one word which is in the pamphlet was ever uttered by him. Now what were they to think of that man who so unblushingly broke the ninth commandment, who makes assertions for him (Mr Thompson) which he never made? (Hear, hear.) At pages 6, 7, 8, and 9, the writer endeavours to prove that the slaveholder of the United States belongs to the primitive church. Now he (Mr Thompson) was prepared to prove that the *right of property in man* is nowhere sanctioned in the Holy Scriptures. A gentleman had kindly sent him a communication on the subject, which he would read to the meeting. This individual was an Israelite, a gentleman of respectability and talent. In the communication he asked a question which he (Mr Thompson) could not well answer, whither there were any of his brethren in the United States slaveholders?

Mr DOUGLASS rose and stated that there were great numbers of Jews in the United States, but he had never known one to have been a slaveholder.

Mr THOMPSON then read the communication, which was to the effect that the writer believed he spoke not only his own sentiments, but also those of more than 30,000 Israelites, as well as every practical Christian of Christendom, and philanthropist in the world learned in Bible truth, in declaring there is not a single chapter, verse, or clause in the Hebrew, Greek, or English version of the Old or New Testament that countenances for a moment the aforesaid revolting practice of manstealing, &c. The writer shewed that the Greek word used by the pamphleteer did not bear the meaning he had given to it; and demonstrated that he was not only wrong, but absolutely ignorant of the Greek Testament Scriptures. Mr Thompson then quoted from the pamphlet respecting the late Dr Andrew Thomson, who was not only a doctor of divinity but an enlightened philanthropist and philosopher. "You spoke," says the pamphleteer, "the other night of Dr Andrew Thomson as a man who, if he had been alive, would have acted a part very different from that acted by those who have followed him. But, Sir, are you aware that Dr Thomson lived a denial to your assertions —that he not only admitted slaveholders to membership, but *even associated with them in his kirk-session.*" Now, said Mr Thompson, I have got a precious piece of information on this subject, which will set that matter at rest. I will

read it, inviting your special attention to its contents. Mr Thompson then read the document, which was as follows:—"There never was in Dr Andrew Thompson's lifetime any member of his session that had any connection with slaveholding, or slave property; nor at any time after Dr Thompson's death, was any person of that description a member of the St George's session, except one, a Mr Murray, who was introduced into the session by Dr Candlish, and *went out* with him. It was a daughter, I believe, of this Mr Murray, that since the disruption, married, and made a rich man of Mr A. Dunlop, one of the prime movers of the secession in 1843." Mr Thompson also quoted from a speech delivered by Dr Thomson in 1830, which expressed in decided language his views on the scriptural bearing of the question. "I flatter myself," said the doctor, "I have said enough to show that those who take shelter under Christianity, as if that afforded any countenance to the slave system, are either ignorant or regardless of that revelation of divine mercy—that when they appeal to the Scriptures as sanctioning what they are so unwilling to renounce, they do nothing less than put a blasphemous commentary on the contents of that sacred volume. And it is worth mentioning, that the subject was practically viewed in that light by many eminent persons in the earlier ages of the church. For instance, Constantine exercised his authority in facilitating the manumission of slaves, allowing the ceremony to be performed on the Lord's-day, because he considered it a religious or Christian act. Gregory the Great emancipated his own slaves, and encouraged others to do the same, on the principle that our Redeemer took upon him our flesh, in order to deliver us from the bondage of sin; and that, therefore, we should give back freedom to those whom the law of nations had deprived of it. They did this, not under the gradual influence of the gospel, but from the knowledge and conviction that it is directly hostile to slavery, and that its true and enlightened votaries cannot consistently hold human beings in bondage." (Much cheering.) Mr Thompson next referred to page 5 in the pamphlet, where the author alludes to the case of Philemon and Onesimus, as illustrative of the relation that then subsisted between a Christian slaveholder and his slaves. This Mr Thompson denied, and showed that it was in opposition not only to the scope of the epistle itself, but to the spirit of Christianity. If the views of the writer were insisted on as correct, as the Free Church had adopted the pamphlet, if they had it in their power they would send back Frederick Douglass to his master, as they say Paul did with the runaway slave Onesimus. Now, St Paul could not do that, for he knew the law better. Such a course of procedure would have been in opposition to the law of Moses, which was to the effect, that if a servant escape because of oppression, he should not be sent back to his master. Paul, however, did not return Onesimus as a lacerated slave to his master; if he had done so, he would have violated the law of Christ; but he returned him above a servant, a "brother beloved;" and if there was any obligation in the matter, he entreated Philemon to put it down to his (Paul's) account. Mr Thompson next referred to the statement in the pamphlet relating to Argyle Square Chapel. In vindication of the late Mr Aikman, he showed that that gentleman did not build the chapel on the profits of slaveholding, but from the proceeds of his bookselling business while in Jamaica. He once did possess a slave, left him at his brother's decease; but he emancipated him, and settled upon him an annuity for life. (Immense cheering.) If this gentleman, continued Mr Thompson, reaped any advantage from the possession of a slave, he amply repaid that advantage; let the Free Church follow his example, and send back the money. (Applause.) They had gone back fifty years to rake up this case against Mr Aikman, but they had completely

failed; and even had they succeeded, it would not have been surprising, for there had been a great advance during that period. I venture to predict that, however in the time of their prosperity the members of the Free Church Assembly may affect to treat with indifference and contempt both the act they have committed and those who are calling them to account for that act, the time will come when they will regard the affair under a very different aspect, and with far other feelings—feelings which I would fain have them render impossible by a speedy act of repentance and reformation. Sir, there was once in olden time a band of brothers, who, forgetful of the claims of fraternity, and swayed only by motives of envy, cast one of their number into a pit, from which they afterwards drew him out and sold him to a company of Midianitish merchants. This brother was sold again in Egypt, was promoted in the house of Potiphar, and afterwards raised to stand before Pharaoh the king of Egypt, and to take charge of the affairs of the kingdom. While all things went well, the brothers thought not of Joseph. But there arose a famine in the land, and as there was corn in Egypt, they went down to buy—little dreaming that to the brother they had sold into bondage they would be indebted for the means of keeping their souls alive. You know that when they stood in the presence of their brother, he spoke roughly to them, called them spies, and awakened bitter recollections in their minds; for he, too, remembered the dreams which he had dreamed of them. And now, when they were in trouble and trembling under the displeasure of the man at the head of Pharaoh's house, they called to mind their most unnatural treatment of Joseph, and said one to another, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us and we would not hear him; therefore is this distress come upon us." (Loud cheers.) And Reuben answered them, saying, "Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child; and ye would not hear? Therefore behold also his blood is required." (Cheers.) Now, let the Free Church beware. All may appear to go well; the money may come in; the crops may be abundant; the sin that has been committed may be, for a time, unrepented-of and forgotten. But, as sure as there is a law of retribution, so sure will the season come when the Free Church will call to mind her present doings. She cannot wipe away her reproach by anything but contrition, restitution, and the abandonment of her guilty compact with the blood-contaminated churches of America. She may persist in the course which her pride and self-sufficiency and affected scorn of public opinion may dictate; but the season of famine will come. She will lose the respect of the purest and best of her own members; she will stand isolated and alone among the religious bodies of this kingdom as the *one* solitary church that retains her grasp of the manstealer's hand. Her influence, as a high-minded and consistent body will be no more; and then, in some future Assembly, when the frown of the world is upon her—when poverty and weakness have overtaken her, and her once proud leaders are in a mood to look back upon what they have done—some venerable brother, some Free Church Reuben, perhaps some Dr Gordon, will rise and say, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us, and we would not hear him. Therefore is this distress come upon us." (Loud cheers.) Oh, that they were wise, that they understood this. Let them not say they were not warned. When the events of another year have passed away and I stand again in this city—(cheers)—let them not say they were not warned of their danger. They have taken to their communion men who have betrayed the Master they profess to serve, by making merchandise of those for whom He died. "They are guilty concerning their brother." (Cheers.) He would now

give them a specimen of the language of repentance and joy in the case of an incident in the life of their Lord and Master. He referred to the procedure of Zaccheus, who when Jesus informed him he would abide a day with him, said—"Behold, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him four-fold." Let the Free Church act upon this noble principle of restitution, and send back the money. (Immense cheering.) He (Mr Thompson) would point out another palpable dishonesty that pervaded the pamphlet. When the leaders of the Free Church were anti-voluntaries, they asked a book from him which they published. In that book it is declared that every slaveholder should be put out of the Christian church. What he then asserted was printed by them. They gave currency to the facts which he enunciated. He stood in the same position then which he did now. They did not then brand him with their *courteous* epithets, but then they held him up as the fearless and enlightened opponent of slavery; they asked his support because it served to denounce the Voluntaries, whom they taunted by pointing to his statements regarding the slaveholders of America. The latter were specially denounced by these men in 1836; but now the tables were turned, and they saw it to be their interest to oppose him. Mr Thompson then referred to the quotation in the pamphlet regarding Dr Ritchie. He was a man that he (Mr T.) honoured; he was seen foremost with the men of Edinburgh in denouncing slavery in all its aspects, and what was insinuated against him was false. I tell them (said Mr Thompson) that what that Free Churchman has written is a falsehood from beginning to end, and that he has been one of the most dishonourable of creatures, and one of the most base calumniators that ever put pen on paper. The testimony of Dr Wardlaw was against slavery, in opposition to the insinuations thrown out by the pamphleteer, in reference to that gentleman. That esteemed friend (said Mr Thompson) was chairman at the discussion which he held in Glasgow with Mr Brackenridge of the United States. After the discussion the citizens of Glasgow held a public meeting for the purpose of declaring their sentiments on the subject. At that meeting Dr Wardlaw delivered a speech against the American slaveholding churches, in which the rev. doctor said that the "shocking details of American slavery were to a sad extent the sin of the Church." "To vindicate the ministers and churches of America was avowed as one of Mr B.'s principal objects. In no point did he more signally fail. The defence was feeble, inefficient, and fruitless. The facts against him were overwhelming." "If then fellowship with the American church requires to be maintained by connivance at iniquity and oppression—if it is not to be enjoyed without our entering into a compact to be silent or to be inactive on topics on which we feel it our incumbent and indispensable duty to lift up our voice like a trumpet, and show our brethren their sin—then, I say, with whatever reluctance and whatever pain, let the fellowship cease." (Immense cheering.) Now (said Mr Thompson) the remonstrance which was sent but last year to the slaveholding churches by the Free Church was not a voluntary act, but extorted. (Hear, hear.) It was an apology for taking the money. They received the money. It produced in return the deliverance of 1845. Had that document been one of sorrow, instead of justification, they (Mr Thompson and his friends) would not have been here to expose the jugglery. The Free Church wanted now to shift their ground, but there was no denying the fact that Dr Cunningham came out boldly and fellowshipped with the slaveholder. Let them alter their position as they may, they must ultimately resolve to send back the money. (Great applause.) Mr Thompson then vindicated the Baptist Society of London, who, he said, had reprobated their deputation, Messrs Cox and Hoby (the gentlemen referred to by the writer

of the pamphlet as authorities in their opinions of the *Southern brethren*). The Baptist body (Mr Thompson said), in all their subsequent publications and procedure, showed that they had never any sympathy with the feelings of their deputation, and now they had cut all connection with American slaveholding churches. He then stated, at great length, another charge of dishonesty against the pamphleteer in the case of mis-quotation from Dr Channing—that, while the doctor's condemnation of the policy of a part of the abolitionists was quoted, his qualification of that censure had been entirely omitted, which showed his approval of the motives and intentions of the majority. This Mr T. proved by close examination of the original work. He also quoted the last published opinions of the same eminent author, who more than ever approved of the principles and procedure of the abolitionists as philanthropists in the great and universal cause of human freedom. (Applause.) Honesty, said Mr Thompson, demanded from the author of this pamphlet the insertion of the several quotations which he had detailed; but honesty was not his policy. In fact, he had shown himself to be a moral assassin and an enemy to society. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Mr Thompson—in quoting these last words from Dr Channing in allusion to the violence and recklessness of the abolitionists, "Why this singular sensitiveness to anti-slavery vehemence, except it be *that slavery, which so many call an evil with the lips, has never come as an evil to their consciences and their hearts*"—said, judge not of men by their language merely, but by their acknowledged principles and avowed practices. Will the Free Church apply this rule of judgment to the language which their honoured John Knox was called upon to use on many occasions? No! they won't. But these men build the tombs of the prophets and crucify the Lord Jesus in his followers. Among their friends, there has never yet been language used that comes within a thousand miles of the moral turpitude of the crime of slaveholding. (Cheers.) He (Mr Thompson) was now done with this pamphlet. He would characterise it as one falsehood throughout all its various charges. Mr Thompson then concluded by saying that all they wish is the abolition of slavery. They were the friends of human freedom. Do not adopt my language, said he, but take my principles. If you think the Free Church has, by her procedure, injured the cause of freedom, let your language be ever towards them, "Send back the money!" (Mr Thompson's speech occupied about three hours in its delivery. He concluded amidst thunders of applause.)

Mr JAMES BALLANTINE, student of divinity, then rose and proposed the following resolution:—"That in the judgment of this meeting, Mr George Thompson has successfully met and refuted the statements relative to himself, contained in a pamphlet entitled 'The Free Church and her Accusers.'"

Dr ALEXANDER, of Argyle Square Chapel, in seconding this resolution, remarked that Mr Thompson in a former speech had become security for him that he did not sanction what was ascribed to him by the author of the pamphlet referred to, and Mr Thompson had justly judged of him in so doing. He felt some difficulty as to how he would meet the assertion, because the writer says that he was on the same side of the question as himself. If the writer of that pamphlet means to say that he (Dr Alexander) expressed an opinion favourable to the Free Church in her present connection with the slaveholding church of America, in having taking their money, he must solemnly declare that he did not, by any word spoken or written, give any sanction to such an opinion; and if the writer meant to assert that he had in any way approved of the deputation when they came home, he was equally mistaken. If he had given any opinion on the subject, it had ever been on the other side of the question, and Mr Thompson was right when he gave that assurance to the meeting. (The rev. gentleman was heard with much silence and attention, and his explanation, at its conclusion, was received with enthusiastic applause.)

The motion was then put to the meeting, and was carried unanimously. The meeting then adjourned at eleven

On Saturday, 30th May, the subject of holding friendly intercourse with the Churches in America was brought before the Assembly by certain overtures and a petition. The very mode in which this subject was introduced kept it free from the mean and vulgar cry of "Send back the money," which had been raised by certain parties, for what purpose they best know, but evidently with no love to the Free Church, and with no direct aim of benefiting the slaves in America. As might have been expected, the discussion assumed a very different tone from that employed by the hireling declaimers, who had for some time been attempting to mislead or deafen the public. We did not expect, certainly, that the arguments of Dr Candlish, Dr Duncan, and Dr Cunningham, would convince those itinerant haranguers; but we are satisfied of this, that by irrefragable arguments, based on the immutable principles of reason and Christianity, they have fully vindicated, in the estimation of all truly candid and intelligent persons, the conduct of the Free Church with regard to her intercourse with the Churches in the slaveholding States of America. Mr George Thompson, the chief assailant of the Free Church, has committed a great blunder, of which he is himself probably aware by this time, though we do not expect him to make that admission. He has resorted to the base artifices of calumny and slander against men and a Church whose character is too high for him to reach it, and the back-falling of his poisoned shafts is destroying the remains of his own reputation. We may deplore this, for the sake of what he once was, or seemed to be; but the blame is his own. Meanwhile, we cannot regret that the controversy has arisen. The Free Church is as great an opponent of slavery, and as true a friend to the emancipation of slaves as ever was, is, or can be on earth, and will continue to prosecute her own enlightened and Christian measures for the deliverance of the oppressed from unjust and cruel bondage, uninfluenced by the outcry that has been so ferociously raised against her. It does seem somewhat strange to mark the course of events during but a short period. Other Churches were wont to hold friendly intercourse with American Churches, and to extol them loudly, notwithstanding the fact of the existence of slavery among them; but no sooner did the Free Church enter into that intercourse, than an outcry was raised, loud, long, and vehement, as if the Free Church had been the cause of that slavery which she only detested and condemned. But we need not prosecute the subject; nor need we give any outline of the speeches of Drs Candlish, Duncan,

and Cunningham, as these, we trust, either already are, or speedily will be, in the hands of all our readers, and of the public generally. We think it right, however, to draw attention to the felicitous phraseology of Dr Duncan, in which he draws a just and very important distinction between slave-*holding* and slave-*having*.) The idea implied in the distinction was, of course, not new to any thinker; but the definite expression may convey it directly and clearly to many a person who has not thought much on the subject. Slavery is sinful in itself, so that wherever there is slavery there is sin. Where, then, lies the sin? Not in the fact of any man being a slave—that is, not on the slave himself; not even necessarily on the man who *has* a slave, if it be not in his power to give that slave civil liberty, while, though he cannot make him free in the eye of the law, he treats him as a free man; but on the man that *holds* a slave—treats him as a slave, claims possession of him by force, and approves of the unjust and cruel laws that give man property in man. It may be a man's great misfortune that he lives in a country where he must *have* slaves, if he be not a slave himself; but the sin is not necessarily his, unless he also *hold* the slave—use the full power which law gives him, and prevent the slave from obtaining freedom. This is the distinction between slave-*having* and slave-*holding*; whence it is clear, that the sin of slavery rests on the slave-*holder*, and not necessarily on the slave-*haver*. There is, however, we apprehend, too much reason to believe, that their close contact with the sin of slavery has very much deadened the American Churches in the slaveholding States, so that they are not sufficiently alive to its horrible enormities, nor sufficiently energetic in their efforts to procure its abolition. Our duty is, to rouse them from this apathy, to stimulate them to fresh and quickened zeal, to aid them by every means in our power, and not to slacken in our exertions till the last link be dashed from the fettered limbs of the last slave. From this course we will not be driven by any amount of popular outcry, raised by those who seem to be actuated less by love and pity for the slave, than by hatred, envy, and malice against the Free Church. Many who formerly swelled the outcry are now ashamed of it—many more will soon be so; but though that storm die away, —when the itinerant haranguers find their occupation gone, the Free Church will continue her earnest endeavours to spread the blessings of civil and religious liberty all over the world, to the utmost extent of her growing name and influence. This duty she owes to God and man; and, by the grace of God, she will not fail to discharge it.

SEND BACK THE MONEY.

THE COMMITTEE of the EDINBURGH EMANCIPATION SOCIETY having officially declined to call a Public Meeting, to consider the duty of the Free Church of Scotland in reference to the question of retaining the Money received from the Slaveholders of America, Mr. H. C. WRIGHT proceeded from Glasgow to Edinburgh on the 22d of April, and, returning on the following day, reported that he had obtained the use of Mr. M'Gilchrist's Church, in Rose Street, for a Public Meeting on the evening of Tuesday the 28th, and the Church of Mr. French, in College Street, for the evening of Wednesday the 30th; and had also arranged for a Public Meeting of the Ladies of Edinburgh, on the morning of the 30th. Messrs. THOMPSON, DOUGLASS, and BUFFUM arrived in Edinburgh on Monday evening, the 27th of April, and proceeded to the York Temperance Hotel, in Nicholson Street. They were joined by Mr. WRIGHT during the following day. These gentlemen found the city in a state of deep excitement on the subject of their visit, and the *vexed question* to which it had reference.

We shall now proceed to give a sketch of the Meetings held between the 27th of April and the 2d of May. The oldest inhabitant of Edinburgh is unable to recollect a period of more intense or universal interest. Our report of the proceedings of the Meetings held by the gentlemen already named will be necessarily brief, and our object will be to describe the spirit which prevailed at these Meetings, rather than to report the speeches which were delivered.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

I.—REV. MR. M'GILCHRIST'S CHURCH, ROSE STREET.

Tuesday Evening, April 28th.

THIS spacious and commodious Church is situated in the New Town, at the back of Princes' Street. On the present occasion it was crowded to excess, by a highly respectable audience. Not only was every pew occupied, but in every part where standing room could be obtained, whether above or below, there was a dense mass of human beings. The entrance of the speakers from the door leading from the Session-house, was the signal for loud and prolonged cheers. In a few moments Mr. George Thompson ascended the pulpit stairs, and was hailed with enthusiastic applause. Mr. Thompson appeared deeply affected by his reception, and, at the same time, to labour under deep embarrassment, arising from the nature of the duty he was about to discharge. On silence being restored, he proceeded in a low and solemn tone to say, that he desired, in the first place, to return his fervent thanks to the esteemed minister and managers of the Church in which he then stood, for their liberality and kindness in granting it on that occasion. [Loud cheers.] He now had the extreme sorrow of addressing his friends in Edinburgh on the question of slavery under a far different aspect from that which he anticipated when he was last among them. He came (he did not hesitate to own) to oppose the Free Church of Scotland—not that he

wanted to enlist their prejudices against that church as such, or decry them in public estimation as, in other respects, a body of Christians; but, inasmuch as they had, by a recent act, inflicted one of the deepest wounds on human freedom that had been experienced for a century, he should denounce that act, and do his best to bring them to repentance. With his friends, he had celebrated the extinction of slavery in the British colonies; but little did he dream that it would ever fall to his lot to oppose in this country any Christian body on these principles, and far less that of the Free Church, who had in this matter broken the hearts of the friends of liberty, by giving the means of exultation to the slaveholders in America. He had arrived in the city for the purpose of fearlessly stating his views on the relations of the Free Church to the momentous question of slavery. He was accompanied by gentlemen on this mission, in whose Christian principles and practice he had the fullest confidence. He came to sympathise and to identify himself with them, because he had seen epithets and charges of an invidious nature heaped against them. He had seen them associated with principles which both he and his friends deprecated. He wished to be included in the same bill of indictment with them, and what was therefore cast at them, would be thrown against him likewise. [Loud cheers.] Within a few hours of coming to this house, I have, as John Bunyan would have said, "lighted upon a certain pamphlet, made up of extracts from a book written by one of the Free Church delegates to the United States—the Rev. George Lewis of Dundee. To that pamphlet is affixed a preface, which I will also make the preface to my speech, and the ground-work of some remarks. This I consider both just and necessary, as my friends before you are implicated in the charges here made, as well as the characters of those who are not present to defend themselves against their calumniators. I will read this precious and anonymous specimen of Free Church clerical vilification, sentence by sentence, and give my answers to each. [Cheers.]

1. "There is a party in the United States of America, which arrogates to itself distinctively the title of *Abolitionists*, and claims the exclusive credit of seeking the emancipation of the oppressed negroes."

To this I reply, that I know of no such party. I know of many parties who are seeking "the emancipation of the oppressed negroes"—such as the *Garrison* party, the *Liberty* party, the *Anti-Texas* party, (composed of men of all creeds in politics and religion,) the *free-produce* party, the *Episcopal Methodist* party, the *American and Foreign* party, and others; but not one of these claims "exclusive credit." In all, their fundamental principle is the same—all equally condemn the Free Church delegates. As a proof of this let me state, that when Mr. Lewis and his colleagues landed in America they were met by a remonstrance from the Committee representing the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society—a Society opposed to that which my friends here represent, but only in reference to the means and instrumentalities by which the common cause should be promoted; and in that remonstrance I find the following words:—"It is with astonishment and grief that we have learned that you have commenced a tour through the slave states of this Union, with a view to solicit funds, as well of slaveholders as of other persons. Doubtless you will be warmly greeted, especially by that portion of the people who hold their fellow-men and fellow-Christians in bondage." "Will you now, as you are witnesses of that iniquity that filled you with deep disgust at a distance, make common cause with that religion, and clasp hands with its defenders, and accept their blood-stained offering. The fiend can well afford to pay you tens of thousands, for he knows that your countenance is worth millions to him. If he can purchase the silence of the successors of John Knox and Andrew Thomson, if he can number them among his allies, he may well think his victory complete." [Loud cheers.] Now, my friends, let us see who signed this remonstrance, against whom the charge of heresy or unsoundness was never brought—ARTHUR TAPPAN, an office-bearer in the Presbyterian Church—[cheers]—SIMEON S. JOCELYN, a Congregational Evangelical minister at New Haven—[cheers]—LEWIS TAPPAN, a Presbyterian office-bearer in the Broadway Tabernacle—[cheers]—Theodore S. Wright, an orthodox Presbyterian minister in New York—Seth W. Benedict, a Baptist, and others, all men of the most approved evangelical sentiments. Thus have I disposed of the first sentence in this preface, and proved it to be false. [Cheers.]

2. "Many of the leaders of this party have acquired an unhappy notoriety as the prime Apostles of Infidel and Socialist principles, and their measures have been characterised by violence and recklessness."

Who the leaders here referred to are, I cannot tell, for no names are given. I believe I know the leaders of all the various Anti-Slavery parties in the United States, and, above all, I am most intimate, and have been for years, with the leaders of that party, with which my friends now present are most closely connected; and I do not know of *one* man among them tainted with either Infidel or Socialist principles, or who has obtained any notoriety for being so, except among those Slaveholders and their abettors, with whom Mr. Lewis took "sweet counsel." These are those who said of our Saviour, whose cause Mr. Lewis *betrayed* in the southern states, "He hath a devil;" and I know that the cry has been raised against all who have uplifted their voices in favour of no union with slaveholders, "They are Infidels and Socialists;" but I, who know the men so reviled, know that there are no men in the world whose reverence for Christianity is deeper, or whose practice of it is more consistent, than those here so foully and so cruelly maligned. I tell Mr. Lewis that these men have been living the *life* of Christ, and have endured the spoiling of their goods, the buffeting of their persons, and the assassination of their reputation for the *cause* of Christ, while he has merely been bearing the *name* of Christ, has known only the baptism of John, and the ordination of the Presbytery—has been revelling in the hospitalities of menstealers and oppressors—has been obtaining their money by his recreant silence on the subject of their sins, and has been using his lips and his pen to cover them with the black venom of his bigotry and malice.

3. "The consequence of their (the American abolitionists) extravagant proceedings, and of the more prominent positions in their counsels being taken by men whose sentiments are *at variance with Christianity*, with *social order*, and *public morality*, has been to detach from their ranks the large majority of those ministers and laymen in the Free States opposed to slavery, whose counsels and co-operation alone could have lent moral weight and influence to the movement."

I know not how to reply to this unsupported, scandalous, and wicked calumny. Here are no names, no quotations, no references, but a sweeping assertion that those who occupy the more prominent positions in the American Anti-Slavery Society are the enemies of Christianity, of social order, and of public morality! Come forth, thou nameless accuser of the brethren! [Loud cheers.] Come forth, I say! I publicly charge thee with falsehood of the blackest kind;—I challenge thee to support these imputations;—I defy thee to name the parties who deserve them. Did I know thee, I would brand thee to thy teeth, with forming, in ignorance or malice, a baseless and atrocious libel against the truest and the best of men. Come forth! thou moral scavenger, and then—

> "Thy name—thy human name—shall hang on high,
> Exalted 'midst thy less abhorred compeers,
> To fester through the infamy of years."

[Immense cheers.] Oh! the vile cowardice of those who dare not discuss the merits of this question, but, forsaking the weapons of truth and manly argument, seek to silence their opponents by drawing their bowie-knives in the dark, and stabbing them to the heart. [Cheers.] Truly, the men, their weapons, and their cause, are well matched!

4. "Instead, therefore, of advancing the cause of Abolition, these so-called *Abolitionists* have *brought the very name into contempt*, and have *indefinitely postponed the dawning of the day* which shall witness the breaking of the chains of the oppressed millions who groan in slavery, in the midst of a people boasting themselves the freest in the world."

Another falsehood. The men who, in their own country, have lived down mobs and persecutions—who have multiplied abolitionists by thousands, and Anti-Slavery Churches by hundreds—who have purified the New England States, and lifted the hated doctrine of Emancipation from the dust, to occupy the high places of the land, and to be spoken through the lips of Senators and Governors—who have abolished jailors and Jim Crow cars, and negro pews—who have shaken every religious denomination and society to its centre on the question—who have held their meetings in State Houses, and their bazaars in Fanuil Hall—who are feared where they were once contemned, respected by those who once reviled them, and loved with fervour, instead of being scorned with malignity—these men have brought the very name of abolition into contempt, and have postponed indefinitely the dawning of the day of freedom! Out upon such foolishness and

falsehood! Why, the very men who bought Mr. Lewis with a mess of pottage, and purchased the Free Church for the sum of £3000, would not say so. I know they rage, and foam, and fulminate in the south; I know that they sing hymns one day with dear brother Lewis, and the next drive their converted negroes to the auction block, and then attend Lynch Committees to concert measures for the overthrow of Abolitionism; but the feeling farthest from their hearts is that of contempt, or the supposition that the efforts of the Abolitionists are to be disregarded. Mr. Lewis has himself told us, in twenty different parts of his book, of their sensitiveness, their fears, and their exertions on the subject; and then he says that the very name is held in contempt. The wish is father to the thought. It is not abolition, but the name of Mr. Lewis, and the falsehood of his preface-writer, that will hereafter be held in contempt.

5. "Having accomplished nearly all the mischief which was possible on the other side of the Atlantic, these *quasi Abolitionists* have lately sent a deputation of three of their number to this country, who are now, and have for several months back, been perambulating the land, addressing public meetings, and everywhere most efficiently sustaining, by their extravagant, reckless, and calumnious speeches, the evil reputation which American Abolitionists have so unhappily won for themselves."

"Evil reputation"! These men are strangers, who have had nothing to recommend them but the cause they advocate, and their own talents and virtues. They have been welcomed by the sincerest friends of freedom—they have occupied numerous churches—they have received the countenance and co-operation of large numbers of the members of the Free Church—they have addressed a great many public meetings, and in all have carried the hearty unanimous votes of their hearers—they are daily increasing the number of their friends and supporters, and are forcing the dignitaries of the church and the organs of Mr. Lewis to do double work, to save themselves from defeat by their former adherents—and, when all this has come to pass, they have only won for themselves the evil reputation ascribed to their brethren over the water—that is, the reputation of being Infidels, Socialists, and the enemies of Christianity, public morality and social order! [Cheers.] Let this harmless scribe know that these gentlemen do not happen to be a deputation—further, that not one of them came here on the Free Church question, but that they are independent in their actions—uncontrolled in their movements and their plans, and that the apostacy of Mr. Lewis and his friends is the sole cause of their perambulations through the land—perambulations during which they have arraigned Mr. Lewis in his own town; who, when they challenged him to appear and justify his conduct, was *non est inventus;* but who, when they had left, forthwith became as valiant, or nearly so, as he had been in America, and proceeded to answer his frank and honest accusers—not with arguments but with two pages of abuse from a kindred and fraternal pen. [Cheers.]

6. "The Free Church has been the chief butt of the assaults of these vagrant orators. She is the only Church which has of late years formally protested against slavery, and remonstrated with the Churches in the slave states of America with respect to its existence in the midst of them."

This is extremely edifying. For the last ten years, and during the whole of the time that the gentlemen who are now the most shining luminaries in the Free Church constellation were waging war against their Voluntary brethren, the United Secession Synod, the Reformed Presbyterians, the Relief Synod, the Baptist Associated Churches, and the Congregational Union of Scotland, have been almost every year adopting the most uncompromising remonstrances against slavery in the United States, and sending them across the Atlantic. And now we are modestly told that the Free Church—the Church that has fellowshipped slaveholders, and put the plunder of the slaves into her sustentation fund—is the only Church which has of late years protested against slavery! But, perhaps, this writer means that she is the only Church that has protested against slavery in the same way as herself. If so, I am most entirely of his opinion. She *is* the only Church, *bond* or *free*, that has remonstrated against slavery by apologising for slaveholders, by taking slaveholders into her fellowship, and by receiving into her possession the substance wrung from God's poor. From this time to the end of the world may she stand alone in this respect; and may the censure with which she is visited be a warning to other churches how they pretend to be the enemies of slavery, while they give countenance, encouragement, and strength to those who support the system. I have now done with Mr. Lewis and his pamphlet. Hereafter I shall pursue a higher quarry. [Loud cheers.]

Mr. THOMPSON then commented on the conduct of Dr. Cunningham in a strain similar to that adopted at Glasgow, and con-

cluded by reading a challenge which he had sent to the Doctor, and also caused to be placarded through the city. After some lengthened remarks on the subject, Mr. Thompson introduced Mr. Douglass.

After an able address from Mr. Douglass, which seemed to produce a deep impression upon the audience,

Mr. Wright then rose, and stated that he had a proposition to make, to the effect, that his friend, Mr. Douglass, should present a Memorial on this question to the Free Church Assembly at their meeting next month, signed by himself, presenting it for himself, and claiming to be heard by that body. [Immense applause.]

Mr. Thompson warmly seconded the proposition. Mr. Douglass had every claim to be heard. He represented three millions of slaves—he knew from experience the curse of slavery—the iron had entered his soul—the lash had scourged his back;—and as for talent, no member of the Free Assembly would be degraded by an entrance into the lists with Frederick Douglass. To the Assembly let him go; if refused a hearing, let him sit there and bear a silent testimony against the conduct of that body. [Cheers.] He would conclude the meeting by a word of friendly warning to the Free Church. That body, or rather the leaders of that body, might think themselves strong enough to withstand the demand, but they would find themselves mistaken. The tide was rising that would bear them down if they much longer resisted. But he would rather appeal to their love than to their fears. If, then, they loved their church—if they did not wish that the light that was in her might become darkness—if they desired her usefulness, her perpetuity, and her prosperity, let them make haste to repair the error that had been committed, or as surely as she had been raised up, so surely would she be cast down, and become a bye-word and a proverb. [Cheers.]

The meeting was then concluded, and the great assembly quietly dispersed.

II. LADIES' MEETING IN MR. M'GILCHRIST'S CHURCH, ROSE STREET.

Wednesday Evening, April 29.

This meeting was most respectably attended, and was addressed by Messrs. Wright, Thompson, and Douglass, who respectively addressed the assembly upon the position and prospects of the Anti-Slavery cause, and the means which the women of this country had it in their power to employ for the good of those in bonds. Mr. Wright reviewed the progress of the cause in America, and narrated the history of the Boston Anti-Slavery Society in Boston from the period of the famous mob of property and standing gentlemen in 1835, to the holding of the bazaar in Fanuil Hall in 1845. He concluded with an earnest and solemn exhortation.

Mr. Thompson dwelt largely upon the duty and desireableness of entering the Anti-Slavery cause in the true spirit of liberality, cheerfully and gratefully accepting the assistance and co-operation of all who sincerely loved the slave. He rejoiced that, in such a cause, persons of all denominations might labour together in harmony without any sacrifice of principle, or any compromise of their destructive peculiarities. He described in touching terms the labours, fidelity, and unwavering zeal of his friends in America, and called upon his hearers to esteem it a high privilege to be associated with such devoted fellow-labourers in the noble cause of human freedom.

Mr. Douglass delivered a very effective speech, pointing out the great principles which united the abolitionists of America and sustained them, giving at once sublimity to their enterprise, and effect to their exertions. All present seemed highly delighted with the proceedings of the meeting.

III. MEETING IN COLLEGE STREET CHURCH.

Wednesday Evening, April 29.

Long before the time for the commencement of proceedings, this great building was crowded to suffocation in every part, by a highly respectable audience. We have scarcely ever seen an edifice of the same size so densely thronged. At the hour of seven,

Mr. James N. Buffum ascended the pulpit, (after having been introduced by Mr. Thompson,) and in the course of a speech, which deeply interested the audience, he produced some instruments employed on the plantations of the slave states in America, and gave a history of the manner in which they had been used. This exhibition excited a most painful sensation in the immense congregation.

Mr. Thompson then presented himself, and was received with reiterated plaudits. He said that in all former discussions on the question of slavery in this country, they had taken for granted what was now disputed, namely, that in the Word of God they could find no vindication of the sin of man-stealing and man-holding. In this very city, he himself was, in former days, opposed to one who advocated the gradual and progressive abolition of slavery, but who never attempted to support his arguments by a single reference to the Gospel—nay more, he did not even deny the evil of slavery in the abstract—and how was he treated? Why, the individual of whom he spoke was not permitted to occupy one single pulpit, whilst he (Mr. Thompson) was everywhere seconded by all; and by none more than those whom he found now, when he was called again from London to advocate the same cause, had adopted the principle that it would be an insult to Christianity and an insult to humanity to refuse sympathy and connection with the degraded slaveholders of the United States. (Cheers.) He could tell them that this was not a question—now that it was raised—which would be allowed to die away and expire—it would enter into their meetings, into their Synods, into their Assemblies, into their Theological Seminaries; and it would be debated again and again until it was made clear and convincing that it was an absolute impossibility for a slaveholder and a Christian to appear in one and the same person. (Cheers.) The question had been placed in this new light by the leaders of the Free Church; and it was apparent to all who looked at the present position of that church in regard to the question that she was in a dilemma—in a predicament from which there was only one way of escape—and that way was the safest, the best, and, above all, the most Christian which could be adopted—namely, to "send back the money." (Cheers.) The silence of the General Assembly of the Free Church was not the silence of assent—it was not the silence of approbation—(cheers)—no, it was the silence of awe—(loud cheers)—the silence of awe inspired by those who, by the might of their talents, their intellect, and their "pride of place," held rule and authority there. (Cheers and disapprobation.) Mr. Thompson then proceeded to show from the Old and New Testaments that there was no authority for holding any man in a state of slavery, though he did not deny that some were in a state of subjection to others, but not in a state of slavery. They could find no law there which declared it death for the second offence of placing the Word of Life in the hands of the young; and that, too, in a land where the trump of freedom had been long sounded—a land from which the Declaration of Independence had been for seventy years promulgated with a voice of thunder to the "king-ridden" nations of Europe, but whose soil was watered by the tears of the bond-man, and in whose borders three millions of our fellow-men were kept from the sound of that trump of liberty by the shackles and the cow-hide of the slaveholder and the oppressor. (Loud cheers.) Yet these were the men, and this the country, for which the Free Church professed so much sympathy, kindness, and Christian feeling. But he would tell that Church that the advocacy of such principles would corrode and fester her to the heart's core, and that she should, in after days, be held up as an example and a warning of a great body of Christians coming out on a point of principle from a National Establishment, to hold communion and Christian fellowship with the man-stealer and the oppressor. (Cheers and some hisses.) They did not walk up to the commandment, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you"—they did not fulfil the parable of the good Samaritan while travelling by the way, for when the priest and the Levite of the Free Church of Scotland—(loud cheers)—were on their way to the American Samaria, they passed not one, but three millions of afflicted fellow-men, without stopping to pour the oil and wine into their wounds, or affording them sympathy or relief—[Loud cheering]—but they accepted the gold and the silver of the task-masters—brought it from the shrine of the American Moloch, and laid it, as a peace-offering, on the altar of the Free Church of Scotland. It was changed days now with Dr. Cunningham indeed, when he could afford to go out of his way to abuse the abolitionists—changed days from the time when he (Mr. Thompson) had heard Dr. Cunningham, in his own house and at his own breakfast table, for more than an hour pour out the eloquence of his soul in indignation against the American slaveholder; and declare that he held no connection so revolting as that of a Christian Church with the traffickers in human blood. [Loud cheers.] They had a meeting last night, they would hold another one to-morrow night, and the next—[Laughter]—there should be no peace in this city now—nor before the meeting of Assembly—nor at the meeting of Assembly—[Cheers]—until this question was brought to a successful issue—in one word, until they had—sent home the money. [Cheers.] They

should wait with patience until they had seen the reception which the memorial of Frederick Douglass would meet with from the Free Church Assembly—a memorial praying to be heard in that body, on behalf of the cause of three millions of those who were once his fellow-slaves. [Loud cheers.] There was at present on sale, in a shop on the North Bridge, in this city, a pamphlet, written by, he would not say who, which declared it a sin—absolutely sinful—that a member of the Free Church should cross the threshold of the Erastian Establishment—which declared that with their brethren in that Church there could be no sympathy—no connection—no communion; but they could turn round and fraternise with the un-Christian, the blood-polluted manstealer, hug him to their bosoms, and thank him for the donation of his ill-gotten wealth, to the coffers of the Sustentation Fund. [Loud cheering.] These were the men who could with one hand uphold the sin of entering into an Established Church, and with the other pour out the vials of their wrath on the head of the unfortunate abolitionist, tell him he was keeping back the cause of anti-slavery, and call him—Infidel. [Loud cheers and hissing.] In conclusion, he called on that venerable father of the Free Church—Dr. Chalmers—he conjured him by his sayings and writings in former days—by his learning, his eloquence, and his power—to go to the ensuing meeting of the Free Church Assembly, and wipe away from her escutcheon the foul blot which had been cast on it. Let this be his first act—let it be done with an expression of sorrow for having let down the standard of Christian purity—and the effect would be, to raise the character and influence of the Church—to carry joy to the hearts of weeping thousands—and a rebuke to slaveholders, that would be more important and effectual than a thousand remonstrances while the money was retained. [Cheers.]

Thus ended the third meeting.

IV. COLLEGE STREET CHURCH.

Thursday Evening, April 30th.

On this occasion the Church was crowded as on the preceding evening, but better order was secured, in consequence of arrangements having been made to prevent pressure and alarm in different parts of the building.

Mr. H. C. Wright was the first speaker, and delivered a masterly discourse on the sinfulness of slaveholding under all circumstances. In a series of propositions, he demonstrated the impossibility of a man holding another human being as a slave, without being a manstealer. He was listened to with profound attention, and concluded by proposing two resolutions, which were carried, with only three dissentients. They were as follow:—

1. That every *American* slaveholder is a manstealer; that the Free Church of Scotland is in league with manstealers; that she sought and received money of manstealers to build her churches and pay her ministers; that she is under an implied contract to receive manstealers to her pulpits and communion; and that inasmuch as her leaders have declared that they cannot annul this alliance with manstealers, while they keep their money thus sought and obtained; therefore it is the duty of the people of the Free Church to demand of their General Assembly that they instantly send back the blood-stained money obtained of manstealers that the guilty compact with them may be at once and for ever dissolved—or if this be not done, to come out from that church thus confederated with men—who have been declared by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America to be "guilty of the highest kind of theft and sinners of the first rank."

2. That so long as this money thus obtained by their consenting to associate the endeared name of *Christian* with *manstealers*, remains in the coffers of the Free Church, that church is bringing disgrace upon all Scotland, whose moral and religious sentiment she professes to represent, and is exposing herself to the merited scorn and execration of mankind; therefore it is the duty of all the people of Scotland to show the Free Church her sin in seeking to associate the name of Christ with slave-breeders and slave-traders, and to throw around them the sanctions of a God of love and justice—thus lending her influence to promote the foulest infidelity and atheism—and this meeting pledge themselves to cry aloud to the Free Church to "Send back the money," till this wicked partnership with manstealers be dissolved, and Scotland redeemed from so foul a blot.

Mr. Thompson then came forward, and was greeted with prolonged cheers. He entered upon a critical examination of the Assembly's deliverance on the subject of slavery, and, by a reference to a mass of documents drawn from the official records of Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and Assemblies in America, proved

that the distinction in the deliverance, between holding man as property and slaveholding, was a doctrine repudiated by the Churches of America in the Southern States. This part of Mr. Thompson's speech seemed to carry entire conviction to the minds of his audience. He next dissected the speech of Dr. Cunningham before the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh, and contrasted the positions there taken with the doctrines maintained by the speaker some years previously. The vast assembly was not dismissed until eleven o'clock, and at that late hour seemed reluctant to quit the house.

V. PUBLIC BREAKFAST

IN HONOUR OF MESSRS. THOMPSON, WRIGHT, DOUGLASS, AND BUFFUM, IN THE WATERLOO ROOMS.

Friday Morning, May 1st.

AT half-past eight the Assembly Room was filled with a most respectable audience—JOHN WIGHAM, Junr. Esq. occupied the chair. On his right and left were the guests intimated to be honoured, and a large number of the well-known and most influential friends of the cause of abolition in Edinburgh. At the conclusion of the breakfast,

The CHAIRMAN rose and said—We are met here this morning to pay a tribute of respect and love to those whom we have invited to this breakfast. [Cheers.] They are gentlemen of whom I may say that the more we see of them, the more we know of their principles and actions, the more we esteem and love them. [Cheers.] I am sure we all hail with delight the presence of our esteemed friend George Thompson. [Loud Applause.] We have all witnessed his labours in years that are past, and I do not hesitate to say that, under the guidance of Divine Providence, he has been one of the most efficient instruments in promoting the blessed cause of human freedom. He now appears once more among us in his old character. [Cheers.] As a member of the Edinburgh Committee, I think I may say we have done what we could. We have sought to place this question of the slaveholders' money in its true light. You have most of you seen our correspondence on the subject, and I trust have read the excellent pamphlet of my friend Dr. Greville. [Hear.] At length my friend G. Thompson has come, whose powerful voice is like a six ton hammer. [Laughter and cheers.] He has only been here a few days, but a mighty sensation has been produced, and I doubt not the happiest effects will follow. [Cheers.] It must not be forgotten, that our dear friend is engaged in arduous labours in London, connected with India, especially in his attempts to place a most worthy prince upon his throne, from which he has been unjustly hurled by the East India Company; and I firmly believe that the uncompromising efforts of my friend will be successful. [Cheers.] He and our other friends who are from the United States will now address us. We meet for a friendly interchange of opinions, and to learn what we can do for the poor slave. It is my desire that we should welcome and support all who are engaged in the sacred cause of human rights, and prove to them that we have no prejudices which prevent us from cordially co-operating with those who are sincerely and disinterestedly labouring in this vineyard. Let us do what we can, and wish God-speed to all who are struggling for justice to the oppressed.

Interesting addresses were then delivered by Mr. Thompson and his companions. Mr. Douglass especially enchained the attention of his audience, by the narration of a number of anecdotes relating to himself and other slaves, who had escaped from bondage. This gentleman exercises a wonderful power over the sympathies of his audience. He is alternately humorous and grave—argumentative and declamatory—lively and pathetic. While there is an entire absence of the appearance of any effort after effect, there is the most perfect identity of the speaker with the subject on which he is dwelling, and an extraordinary power of rousing corresponding feelings in the minds of those whom he addresses. This power was singularly manifested on this occasion, and none, we think, who heard him, will ever forget the impression produced upon themselves, or the effect produced upon others. The entertainment evidently afforded the highest and purest satisfaction to all present. The audience retired at 12 o'clock.

VI. MEETING OF THE EDINBURGH LADIES' EMANCIPATION SOCIETY IN THE WATERLOO ROOMS.

Friday Morning, May the 1st.

AFTER the breakfast, the gentlemen who had been entertained, met the ladies and friends of this Society. One of the smaller

rooms was crowded to excess. Mr. Whigham again occupied the chair. Mr. Thompson and Mr. Douglass addressed the meeting. At the conclusion of their speeches a resolution was proposed, and carried unanimously, pledging the Society to renewed exertions, and expressive of earnest sympathy with the friends from America, and their co-adjutors on the other side of the Atlantic. A list of names was then taken down of ladies volunteering to furnish contributions to the next Bazaar of the Boston Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society.

VII. MEETING IN THE MUSIC HALL.

Friday Evening, May 1.

This noble and spacious building was crowded to overflowing with a most respectable audience. The admission was by tickets, sixpence each. About 2000 persons were present.

Mr. Douglass delivered a long and eloquent address. The first part of his speech described the condition of the coloured population in the United States, and the treatment which those persons had received who had nobly sought to succour them. The last part of his address was a severe denunciation of those in this country, who had confederated with the slaveholders of America; and, to hide the obliquity and enormity of their act, had recently employed themselves in defaming, ridiculing, and stigmatising himself and his colleagues. None who heard the withering castigation bestowed by Mr. Douglass on the Rev. Mr. Macnaughtan of Paisley, who had branded him as "a miserable and ignorant fugitive slave," will ever forget it. Poor Mr. Macnaughtan! was the cry of many, while listening to the biting satire and annihilating retorts of the "fugitive," who charged the reverend sneerer with taking from the sustentation fund, for his own benefit, that which ought to have been applied to the education of his coloured brethren.

Mr. Buffum made a short but effective speech.

Mr. Thompson followed, but as we understand that gentleman purposes to prepare his speech for the press, we shall not attempt so much as an outline of it. Suffice it to say, it was an examination of the opinions of Dr. Chalmers, on the subject of slavery, at various periods during the last twenty years, and an irrefragable demonstration, that Dr. Chalmers is, on the showing of the deliverance of the Assembly last year, a sinner of the deepest dye; inasmuch as he has, throughout his writings, contended for the sacredness of slave *property*—a doctrine which the Assembly say none can entertain, without being guilty of a sin of the most heinous kind.

The feeling manifested by the audience on this occasion, exceeded that evinced at any of the previous meetings. The exhibition of the views of Dr. Chalmers, contained in his tract entitled "Thoughts on Slavery," and the contrast of these views with the principles laid down in the deliverance, seemed to transfix the audience, with what a person present described, as "mute horror." During this part of Mr. Thompson's address, the emotions of those present were too deep for utterance. The unanimous burst of applause which followed the appeal to the audience,

to testify if the speaker had made out his case against the Doctor, proved that the conviction was universal, that such was the fact.

Mr H. C. Wright then proposed the following resolutions, which were adopted by show of hands, not a hand being raised against them, and so far as could be seen, all voting for them.

1st. "That the Free Church deputation, in going to the slave states of America to form alliance with slave-holders, and to share their plunder, virtually rejected Christianity as a law of life; Christ, as a Redeemer from sin; and God, as the impartial governor of the universe—inasmuch as they pledged themselves and the Free Church, whose agents they were, to receive to their embrace as 'respectable, honoured and evangelical Christians,' men whose daily life is a denial of the existence of a just and impartial God, and a violation of the fundamental principles of Christianity: therefore, by our respect for man as the image of God, and as our equal brother; by our faith in Christ as our Redeemer; and by our belief in a just and impartial God; we pledge ourselves never to cease our efforts, until the Free Church shall send back the money obtained of slave-holders, and annul her covenant with death, and cease to hold up man-stealers as living epistles for Christ."

2d. "That the members of the Free Church owe it as a duty to God and man to come out from her communion, if, after due admonition, her leaders, Drs. Chalmers, Cunningham, and Candlish, cease not to join hands with thieves, and to seek the fruits of their crimes and pollutions to build Free Churches—thus making themselves and all who concur with them accessories to the unutterable horrors of slave-breeding and slave-trading."

What must be the deep conviction, and stern resolution and powerful excitement of the public mind when such resolutions are adopted unanimously by such a meeting, after full and mature consideration? It was the settled conviction of the audience that every slave-holder is a standing type of infidelity and atheism; and that in their consenting to vouch for his Christianity, Drs. Chalmers, Cunningham, and Candlish, do virtually reject Christ as a Redeemer from sin, and deny the existence of a just and impartial God.

Mr. WRIGHT then proposed to adjourn to Tuesday evening, the 5th of May, to meet in the same place, to review the speeches and writings of Dr. Candlish on this great question. (Cheers.) Doctors Chalmers and Cunningham had been reviewed, their apologies for man-stealers fully answered, and their efforts to keep the people of the Free Church in loving communion with slave-breeders and slave-traders had received a merited rebuke. Dr. Candlish had made himself most conspicuous in this conspiracy against three millions of slaves, and in this attempt to introduce man-stealers to social respectability and Christian communion in Great Britain—Let us have one more meeting to consider Dr. Candlish. (Cheers.)

The proposition to adjourn was received with loud applause. The audience then slowly and quietly retired, as if deeply impressed with the solemnity and weight of what had been uttered.

LETTER SECOND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WITNESS.

Blairgowrie, June 5, 1846.

DEAR SIR,—According to promise, I would call the attention of your readers to two of the evils which threaten the peace and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, viz. slavery and Popery. But, before remarking on these subjects, I might state, that after spending sixteen years,—upwards of eight at the College and Theological Seminary of Princeton, New Jersey, and seven in the gospel ministry in the State of New York,—I have come to visit (in all probability for the last time) the land of my fathers, and that, while here, I am desirous of doing what I can to promote the temporal and spiritual interests of the Free Church, and strengthen and perpetuate that friendly intercourse so auspiciously begun between us. I hope that no one will look upon me as the apologist of the slaveholder or the defender of slavery. God forbid that I, or any other member of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or in this country, should say a single word to encourage the one or perpetuate the other. As a system, American slavery (*i. e.* slavery as sanctioned by law) cannot be too strongly reprobated. And if every slaveholder were as cruel—as inhuman—as some of the laws permit them to be, they might well be denominated menstealers and murderers. But this is far from being the fact. On the contrary, many of them are truly humane, and treat their slaves more like children than slaves. To my certain knowledge many of the planters employ missionaries, and pay them out of their own pockets, expressly for the purpose of preaching to their slaves, and instructing them in the principles of our holy religion: they feed and clothe them,—provide medicine when sick,—and, in a word, treat them as fellow-travellers to eternity. Would it not be the very height of uncharitableness to denounce such masters (and there are thousands of such) as fiends incarnate, and murderers? Indeed, I have no hesitation in saying, that in multitudes of cases the slaves are better than those who are merely called servants in Scotland, England, and Ireland; and I would say further, that the condition of the slaves on many a Southern plantation is much better, in almost every respect, than that of the free coloured people of the north. And I have often heard the slave who accompanied his master to the north in the summer time, and who was no longer a slave if he chose to be free, express a longing desire to return to the plantation at the south. I speak not thus to conceal the horrors of the slave laws or slavery as it sometimes exists, but to convince your unprejudiced readers that slaveholders are not always, nor even generally, those monsters of wickedness which they are represented to be by ultra-abolitionists, and the inveterate enemies of the Free Church. But without entering at large into the subject, I have a few questions to ask a candid Christian public. In discussing this subject, ought we not to make a distinction between the abstract question of slavery and slavery in the United States, or as it formerly existed in the West Indies?—ought we not to make a distinction between those who are slaveholders from necessity and those who are so from choice?—ought we not to distinguish between the sin of slaveholding and the sinner? While the former is to be pourtrayed in its true colours, ought not the latter to be reproved, rebuked, exhorted with kindness? Ought we not to make a difference between the sin of the State and the sin of the Church? And, finally, I would ask, can we anathematise every slaveholder, and every Church directly or indirectly connected with slavery, without consigning to perdition the father of the faithful, the apostle Paul, many of the apostolic Churches, and many of the most eminent Churches, ministers, and private Christians of modern times? A candid answer to these questions will, I think, tend to show that the conduct of Abolitionists in urging the Free Church to send back the money, and break off all friendship with the Presbyterian Churches in the United States is uncharitable, unreasonable, and unscriptural. That this

is a political question is manifest from the fact, that the Abolitionists at every election have their candidates, from the President of the United States to the lowest town officer; and that the whole system is regulated by law. I might mention another fact, perhaps not generally known, viz., that every State is independent of every other State, so far as its internal laws are concerned: that therefore Congress cannot abolish slavery in all, or in any of the States. All that Congress could do, would be to abolish it in the district of Columbia. So far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, as a minister of that Church, I would say, it is well-known that in our Ecclesiastical Courts, from the Church Session to the General Assembly, we have unequivocally condemned slavery, and uttered our earnest desire and prayer to see it everywhere abolished. And while I confess that we have not done all that we ought to have done, or all that we might do, I believe that almost any other Church, similarly situated, would have pursued a similar course. In order to be useful as ministers of the gospel, we have stood aloof from the arena of political strife, and, as remarked above, this is viewed as a purely political question in the United States. We must either, therefore, adopt a course which some might term temporising, or still worse names, or identify ourselves with a body of reckless, political agitators, whose principles, or rather whose lack of principles, inevitably lead to the subversion of all morality and religion. To adopt and act upon the maxims of Abolitionists, would be to do what would certainly lead to the expulsion of all our ministers from the slaveholding States, and consequently to cut off every master and every slave from the privileges of a preached gospel. For, let it be remembered that, notwithstanding the slanderous reports of rabid Abolitionists, we have many eminently pious and devoted missionaries and ministers labouring for the temporal and eternal salvation of master and slave without let or hindrance. We are also persuaded that, if the north generally adopted the views of Thompson and Co., it would lead to an immediate dissolution of the Union (an event which no lover of his country can contemplate without horror), or what would be even more awful, it would cover the southern States with carnage and blood. Great, therefore, and much to be deprecated as slavery is, we believe that its abolition, in the way prescribed by such men as Wright and Douglass, would lead to consequences infinitely more to be deprecated by every friend of the slave,—by every friend of humanity and religion. I do not say that I and others are not guilty in not doing more to secure the repeal of the slave laws, and the abolition of slavery. We make no pretensions to infallibility, and we shall ever receive the admonitions, the warnings of Christian ministers and people, with respect, yea, with thankfulness. I am happy to be able to say that sympathy for the slave is increasing in the south as well as the north; (not among those who are technically called Abolitionists, for their influence with the wise and the good is fast waning.) Many of the slaveholders see that slavery is a physical as well as a social, and, if you please, a moral evil; and if the laws permitted it, many who are now in nominal bondage would be immediately set at liberty. And I have no doubt such friendly, affectionate, faithful dealing with slaveholders, as that recommended by Dr Cunningham and others, who can view the subject with the Christian's as well as the critic's eye, and heart, will lead to its speedy banishment from the United States and the world.

As to the fellowship which the Free Church holds with American Churches, I have only to say, that I know not what more could be done by one Christian Church in warning, reproving, and rebuking another for countenancing an admitted sin. True, they might send back the money; but surely a Church that has raised so many hundreds of thousands of pounds by making such noble sacrifices, cannot be supposed to cling to two or three thousand for filthy lucre's sake. Is it true that the blood of the slave oozes from the walls of the Free Churches? Then, surely, if the merchant looks into his treasures he must see the price of blood. He must see it oozing from the cotton bag, the rice, the sugar hogshead; and all the money made by trafficking in these articles must be sent back,—it is the price of blood; and I dare say, that Buffum, Douglass, & Co., would have no ob-

jections to be the bearers of such a golden treasure. But I am ashamed to have been under the necessity of even alluding to this ridiculous outcry about nothing. But I am afraid that the outcry raised against the Free Church at this time by Abolitionists and others, has not sprung from pure zeal for the good of the slave or the purity of the Church. God knows their motives; and in the judgment-day these motives will be revealed to an assembled universe. Before closing this part of my subject, I cannot but express the great pleasure which I enjoyed while reading the admirable speeches of Drs Candlish and Cunningham on this point. I have no doubt such frank, faithful, affectionate admonition will do more to abolish slavery than all the harangues of Abolitionists for twenty years. But will the Free Church cast us off as incorrigible? The Free Church's Head would not have done so,—He has not done so. Blessed be His name. He owns our ministry, and he is adding to our Churches multitudes, I doubt not, of such as shall be saved. The Abolitionists rail against the Free Church as the Pharisees did against Christ,—"this man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." Let the Saviour's answer silence the wickedness of foolish men,—"The whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick." If we are sinners above all the ministers and Churches on the face of the earth, we have the more need of the wise counsels, faithful warnings, and affectionate reproofs of the Free Church. And I have no hesitation in saying that no body of Christians,—no Church now in existence,—has it in their power to do so much good in removing any erroneous views adopted by us on the subject of slavery, as the Free Church of Scotland. Let you, then, who are strong, bear the infirmities of the weak, and your labour shall not be vain in the Lord.

While in Edinburgh, I had an opportunity of hearing Thompson, Douglass, &c., and though their slang, and ridicule, and exaggerated statements, and scurrilous epithets were nothing new to me, I was not prepared to hear such men as Chalmers, Candlish, and Cunningham,—men of whom the world is not worthy,—the public benefactors of the Church, their country, and the world, held up to the scorn and contempt of the ignorant and the ungodly, by such a *noble pair of brothers* as the above-named declaimers; and that, too, with impunity. When I say that Mr Thompson is a splendid declaimer, a master of oratorical finesse, and a master, too, of the lowest Billingsgate, I give him all the credit to which he is entitled, for his speech had not even plausible reasoning, no, nor common sense to recommend it. And as for Douglass, his very self-complaisant, *gracious smile*, his constant efforts to hold up the Free Church and the members of the delegation to ridicule, was enough to convince any unprejudiced mind, that a cause that required such weapons must be indefensible either by Scripture or reason. These gentlemen and their colleagues appear to be haunted day and night with the spectres of murdered slaves. Asleep, awake, they see nothing but the countenance of the slaveholder, grim, horrible, and exceeding fierce, the poor negro wounded, bleeding, dying; they hear nothing but the rattling of chains, the sound of the lash, and the despairing cry of the murdered slave, and they have thought that the exhibition of the lash and the manacles would infuse the abolition mania into the minds of the people of Scotland. But let those who are scattering firebrands and arrows around them with a reckless hand know,—let the people of Scotland know,—that what these pretended friends of humanity and the slave have done, are now doing more to rivet the slave's chains, and perpetuate slavery, than all other influences combined; and that if it really exists. Yes, I say deceived, by a party characterised by those who have seen and known most of its proceedings as reckless and unprincipled, yea, as the enemy of all righteousness. And yet these are the men and this the party which claims to be peculiarly humane and religious. Let them alone, they are blind leaders of the blind. The indignation which they have attempted to raise against others will return upon their own heads; and the people of Scotland will soon see that kind, affectionate, Christian treatment, and faithful expostulation will soon find its way to the slaveholder's heart, and when the ultra violent, unchristian measures of Abolitionists are viewed with abhorrence, three millions of emancipated fellow-immortals will rise up and call you blessed.

Some two years ago a deputation of Free Church ministers was sent to America for the special purpose of collecting money from American Christians, for the maintenance of that denomination of Scotch Dissenters. This was a very proper mission, and in the circumstances a very natural one ; but these ambassadors of freedom were not satisfied with appealing to the free only for the maintenance of freedom. They heard that the slave-holding Churches in the south were richer than the slavery-hating Churches in the north. To the former, therefore, they specially addressed their appeals, and profited in a pecuniary way beyond their most sanguine hopes. This lucrative success was the fruit of two courses—one, dead silence on the enormities of slavery, where that sin was peculiarly luxuriant, and its horrors singularly rife ; the other, strong and racy denunciations of all State Churches, where the voluntary principle was an article of faith. The thing was cleverly done—the dollars and the deputation were shipped, and both returned to Scotland, the Atlantic Ocean having spared them, and this last escape was duly construed as a token of Divine approval.

But this movement, which looked so bright at its dawn, like some others of the same party, set at noon in clouds, and where it was least expected thus to set, in the Cannon-mills. Divers Free Church members and numerous ministers and members of other secession bodies grew very feverish about the dollars, and unmanageably talkative. They would not, or could not, understand how the hands which refused the money of the State, could clutch right cordially the price of negroes—or how the worthies, who rebuke all union between Church and State, revere and recognise union between the chapel and the slave-market—or how a "Free Kirk" could be piously built up with the dollars of slave-holders and slave-whippers.

Dr. CANDLISH showed there was a great distinction between *slave-holding* and *slave-having*, but somehow his Free followers did not see it, and Dr. CUNNINGHAM insisted that the slave-market was a Scriptural institution ; but however plain this may read in American editions, it does not appear in our authorised, or, as the Free folk would say, Erastian version of King JAMES. The only argument which told in the Free-Secession Assembly was, their need of the money. But what was a sop to the ministers was only a stimulant to the people out of doors ; and at this moment the loudest cry ever raised in Scotland is heard in every district, "Send back the money." Unless this is done the Free Church will become a by-word,

ADDRESS OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY TO THE MODERATOR, OFFICE BEARERS, AND MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

GENTLEMEN,—It is not in the spirit of hostility, or even of controversy, that the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society venture to address you on the subject of American Slavery in relation to the American Churches; but feeling, as they do, that it involves the liberty and happiness of nearly three millions of human beings, they are anxious to submit to you certain points which, in their judgment, are of great weight, and which they respectfully and earnestly commend to your grave consideration.

The origin of slavery in the United States is not lost in the obscurity of by-gone ages. It is a plain historical fact, that it owes its birth to the African slave-trade, now pronounced by every civilized community the greatest crime ever perpetrated against humanity. By the laws of Great Britain and the United States, that traffic is declared to be felony and piracy, and in the latter country, pronounced to be worthy of death. Such was the origin of American slavery. And how is it perpetuated? By laws which yield not in their atrocity and wickedness to the original act which tore the Africans from their native homes, and doomed them to perpetual slavery on a foreign shore. By these laws slaves are not ranked among *sentient beings*, but among *things;* they are declared to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners to all intents, purposes, and constructions whatsoever. Such is the cardinal principle of slavery. Its legal incidents as set forth by Judge Stroud, in his sketch of the slave laws of the United States, are as follows:—

"The master may determine the kind, and degree, and time of labour, to which the slave shall be subjected. The master may supply the slave with such food and clothing only, both as to quality and quantity, as he may think proper or find convenient. The master may, at his discretion, inflict any punishment upon the person of his slave. All the power of the master over his slave may be exercised not by himself only in person, but by any one whom he may depute as his agent. Slaves have no legal rights of property in things real or personal; but whatever they may acquire belongs, *in point of law,* to their masters. The slave being a *personal chattel* is at all times liable to be sold absolutely, or mortgaged, or leased at the will of his master. He may also be sold by process of law for the satisfaction of the debts of a living, or the debts and bequests of a deceased master at the suit of creditors or legatees. A slave cannot be a party before a judicial tribunal, in any species of action, against his master, no matter how atrocious may have been the injury received from him. Slaves cannot redeem themselves, nor obtain a change of masters, though cruel treatment may have made such change necessary for their personal safety. Slaves being objects of *property,* if injured by third persons, their owners may bring suit, and recover damages, for the injury. Slaves can make no contract." And to crown the whole, slavery is declared to be "hereditary and perpetual."

It is not deemed sufficient to hold the innocent parents in bondage, but these laws, which violate every principle of justice, humanity, and religion, remorselessly consign their innocent offspring to the same state of degradation and sorrow.

"Such," to use the language of Judge Jay, "is American slavery—a system which classes with the beasts of the field—over whom dominion has been given to man—an intelligent and accountable being, the instant his Creator has breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Over this infant heir to immortality no mother has a right to watch—no father may guide his feeble steps, check his wayward appetites, and train him for future usefulness, happiness, and glory. Torn from his parents and sold in the market, he soon finds himself labouring among strangers, under the whip of a driver, and his task augmenting with his ripening strength. Day after day, and year after year, he is driven to the cotton or sugar field, as the ox to the furrow. No hope of reward lightens his toil—the subject of insult, the victim of brutality, the laws of his country afford him no redress; his wife, such only in name, may at any moment be dragged from his side; his children heirs only of his misery and degradation, are but articles of merchandize; his mind, stupified by his oppressor, is wrapped in darkness; his soul, no man careth for it; his body, worn with stripes and toil, is at length committed to the earth like the brute that perisheth."

In practice, the system of American slavery presents the most revolting features. To detail them would require a volume. The Committee would direct attention to a few of them only, by way of example.

Connected with American slavery as you are probabably aware, there is a vast internal slave traffic carried on between what are technically called the slave-breeding and the slave-consuming states. The victims of this odious trade are variously estimated at from 30,000 to 90,000 per annum. Taking the lowest estimate, the Committee would ask who can sum up the amount of guilt contracted by the traders on the one hand, and of suffering endured by the victims on the other? Neither can be computed. But gentlemen, this inter-state slave-trade derives it chief supplies from the abhorred practice of rearing slaves, as cattle are reared, for the market. In some of the older states it is carried on professionally, and all means are employed to render it productive. The basest passions are elevated to the character of a pursuit. Compulsory unions are made by the proprietors of slaves; and if they prove unproductive, they are broken up without regard for decency or feeling. It is impossible, however, to refer with minuteness to the practices which prevail; it is sufficient to state, that the whole system is an outrage on religion and morals.

Another feature of American slavery is, that it practically dooms the great mass of the slave population to ignorance and vice. The severity of the laws against the instruction of slaves finds its commentary in the measures adopted by slave-holders to prevent the light of knowledge from penetrating their minds. Hence we find a heathen population in the midst of a country which boasts of its religious institutions. From them the Bible is systematically withheld. The great mass of them are destitute of the gospel, and ever will be under the present state of things. These are not

mere assertions; they are admitted facts by all who have any knowledge of the slave states, their laws, and their practices.

In 1833, a Committee of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, to whom was referred the subject of the religious instruction of the coloured population, made a report which has been published, and in which this language is used:—

"Who would credit it, that in these days of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian republic, there are *two millions* of human beings in the condition of HEATHEN, and, in some respects, in a worse condition. From long-continued and close observation, we believe that their moral and religious condition is such that they may justly be considered the HEATHEN of this Christian country, and will bear comparison with heathen in any country in the world. The negroes are destitute of the Gospel, and *ever will be under the present state of things*. In the vast field extending from an entire state beyond the Potomac to the Sabine river, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not *twelve* men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes. In the present state of feelings in the South, a ministry of their own colour could neither be obtained NOR TOLERATED.

"But do not the negroes have access to the gospel through the stated ministry of the whites? We answer, No; the negroes have no regular and efficient ministry; as a matter of course no churches; neither is there sufficient room in white churches for their accommodation. We know of but *five* churches in the slave-holding states built expressly for their use; these are all in the state of Georgia. We may now inquire if they enjoy the privileges of the gospel in their own houses, and on our plantations? Again we return a negative answer. They have no Bibles to read by their own fire-sides—they have no family altars; and when in affliction, sickness, or death, they have no minister to address to them the consolations of the gospel, nor to bury them with solemn and appropriate services."

The marriage tie is not permitted to slaves. Hence the unions which they form are liable to be constantly broken up. The slaves feel this most acutely. But what avails it? Their feelings and their affections are utterly disregarded. The agonies of a slave mother, bereaved of her children, are no more respected than the lowing of cattle after their young. But the Committee beseech you, gentlemen, to remember that this state of things involves a direct violation of God's ordinance of marriage, and leads to a system of immortality too gross to be pourtrayed, and too hateful to be endured, in any community where slavery does not exist. In the case of religious slaves, separated from each other by sale or otherwise, the Baptist Church decided in 1835, that they were to be regarded as civilly dead, and might, therefore, form new connexions.

In the sale of slaves, it occasionally happens that some of this unhappy class are Christians. Favoured by some providential circumstances, they have learned to value the gospel and embrace the Saviour. In these cases, to enhance their value in the market, the fact of their Christianity is dwelt upon with more than ordinary eloquence. But what, gentlemen, is this, but putting up the image of the Redeemer for sale, and vending in the public market-places the graces of the Holy Spirit? Thus we perceive that in the practice

of American slavery, the most daring profanity is linked with so great an amount of atrocious cruelty and moral turpitude as to fill every rightly constituted mind with feelings of horror and dismay.

It is against this execrable system that American and British Abolitionists lift up their voices, and demand with unceasing energy, its immediate and total abolition. If, gentlemen, under a keen sense of the degradation and outrage inflicted on the helpless and unoffending—if, viewing their innocent fellow-creatures manacled, lacerated, and destroyed, under a system of relentless tyranny—if, beholding their fellow-men stripped of their manhood; and women, the glory of men, stripped of their liberty and virtue—if seeing the father unable to protect his son, the mother her daughter from cruelty and infamy, they have sometimes denounced not only the system which admitted of these crimes, but its supporters and abettors—if in the excess of their zeal they have not always acted with discrimination and prudence, surely they might be forgiven this wrong.

The Committee do not make these remarks by way of apology for any who may have been betrayed into the use of language unworthy the dignity of the great subject they have advocated, or which may be supposed to violate the courtesies and charities of life; but they do feel it to be necessary to request you to turn your thoughts away from the advocates of the slave, whose measures you may condemn, to the consideration of the wrongs of the slave himself, and in his person to vindicate the claims of humanity, justice, and religion.

On the character of the recent exciting meetings which have been held in Scotland, the Committee pronounce no judgment, inasmuch as they are neither responsible for their origin, the mode in which they have been conducted, nor for their results. They feel it, however, to be a duty to entreat you to deal with the question to which public attention has been directed, on its own merits, with that calm and unbiassed judgment which is necessary for its proper decision.

By some the heavy charges brought against the American slave system are said to be grossly exaggerated, and one fact is usually adduced to prove it—namely, the increase in the slave-population. The Committee admit that increase; but, gentlemen, a slight glance at the statistics of the subject will convince you that that increase is dreadfully disproportionate to that of the free people of their own colour, notwithstanding all the means resorted to in the slave-breeding states to produce a different result.

The slave population of the United States in 1820, amounted to 1,538,064; in 1830, to 2,009,031; and in 1840, to 2,487,355. The increase in the first decennial period was 470,967, or nearly 31 per cent.; during the second decennial period it was only 477,398, or but little more than 23 per cent.; representing a loss of life between the two periods, on the slave population, of about 150,000! a palpable proof of the murderous severity of the American slave system. But when we come to compare the relative longevity between slaves and the free men of colour, the case assumes a more fearful aspect still. According to Porter, who has examined the tables of population with scientific care, it appears that the number of free people of colour between the ages of ten and fifty-five, in

every ten thousand of that class is 6,243, whereas among the slaves, it is but 5,195, showing a loss of life between these ages of 1,018. Between 55 and 100 the disparity is still greater: free people of colour, 736; slaves, 406. From these facts the general severity of the slave system may be gathered. Now it must not be supposed that the slaves are less prolific than the free people of colour. The reverse of this is the fact. The case stands thus: Free people of colour under ten years of age, 2,884, slaves, 3,394. It is necessary to refer to the practices resorted to in the slave-breeding states to account for this fact, for there production outweighs every other consideration. Another word is not, the Committee presume, required to prove the murderous cruelty and disgusting immorality of this atrocious system.

But it may be asked, what have these statements to do with the American Churches; are they not the guardians of truth, the exemplars of purity, the enemies of slavery, the friends of the oppressed? You do not mean to bring an accusation against them? Yes, gentlemen, speaking generally, the Committee are compelled to say that they are the bulwarks of American slavery. Take any branch of the Churches in the slaves-states, you please, with two or three honourable exceptions, and you will find them not only the apologists, but the abettors of slavery, and the most determined opponents of abolition.

The Committee have before them the proceedings of many of these Churches, or branches thereof, to some of which they will briefly refer. The Charlestown and Carolina Baptist Association, in a Memorial to the Legislature says, "The undersigned would represent that the said association does not consider the Holy Scriptures have made the fact of slavery a question of *morals* at all." And adds, "*The right of masters to dispose of the time of their slaves has been distinctly recognised by the Creator of all things.*" The Union Presbytery of the same city avow their opinions as follows: — "Resolved, that in the opinion of this Presbytery the holding of slaves, so far from being a SIN in the sight of God, is nowhere condemned in his Holy Word; that it is in accordance with the example, or consistent with the precepts of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, &c. The Synod of Virginia has declared its opinion in the following terms:— "Resolved unanimously, that we consider the dogma fiercely promulgated by the said anti-slavery associations—that slavery, as it actually exists in our slave-holding states, is *necessarily sinful*, and ought to be immediately abolished, and the conclusions tha naturally follow from that dogma, as *directly and palpably contrary to the plainest principles of common sense and common humanity, and to the clearest authority of the Word of God.*" It cannot be wondered at that the men who could be parties to such declarations as these should pronounce the Abolitionists to be actuated by "a *misguided and fiendish fanaticism;*" or that a clergyman of Virginia should close a letter, "To Sessions of the Presbyterian Congregations, within the bounds of the West Hanover Presbytery," in the following words:—"If there be any stray goat of a minister among us, tainted with the blood-bound principles of abolitionism, let him be ferretted out, silenced, excommunicated, and left to the public to be disposed of in other respects. — Your affectionate brother in the Lord, Robert N.

Anderson." From an address circulated in South Carolina, written by a clergyman of the M. E. Church, the Committee make the following extract:—"From what has been premised, the following conclusions result:—1. That slavery is a judicial visitation. 2. That it is not a moral evil. 3. That it is supported by the Bible. 4. It has existed in all ages. *It is not a moral evil.* The fact that slavery is of Divine appointment would be proof enough with the Christian that it cannot be a moral evil. So far from being a moral evil, *it is a merciful visitation*—'IT IS THE LORD'S DOING AND MARVELLOUS IN OUR EYES.' And had it not been for the best, God alone, who is able, long since would have overruled it. IT IS BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT." A clergyman of North Carolina, in his sermons on the rights and duties of slave-holders, maintained the following propositions. "*That no man nor set of men in our day, unless they can produce a new revelation from Heaven, are entitled to pronounce slavery wrong; and that slavery, as it exists at the present day, is agreeable to the order of Divine Providence.*" The *Divine rights* of slave-holders he set forth in all their fulness; their duties he held to be the moral obligation to punish slaves when they deserved it, not however to chastise them when in a passion, nor to overwork them; and to be careful to have the slave-children baptized, and *orally* taught to say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments."

These sermons received the approbation of the bishop of the diocese, were published, and extensively distributed in vindication of the claims of the Episcopal Chuch to be considered the champion of slavery. Nor was this all. In South Carolina "The Society for the Advancement of Christianity," consisting of clergymen and laymen, with the bishop at their head, reprinted them as a religious tract for gratuitous distribution. In 1844, the writer, Dr. Freeman, was elevated to the bench as Bishop of Arkansas and Texas, a fitting reward for so important a service. To multiply quotations is unneccessary. The Committee feel persuaded that you, gentlemen, must have been revolted by the references already made. How different in their spirit and truthfulness are they to the noble decision of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States in 1793, when it adopted the "judgment" of the New York and Pennsylvania Synods in favour of "universal liberty;" and appended in 1794 the following as a note to the eighth commandment as expressing the doctrine of the Church on slave-holding:—

"1 Tim. i. 10, The law is made for man-stealers. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment; Exodus xxi. 15; and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or *in retaining them in it. Hominum fures, qui servos vel liberos abducunt, retinent, vendunt, vel emunt.*—Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and KEEP, SELL, OR BUY THEM. To steal a freeman, says Grotius, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances, we only steal human property, but when we steal, or retain men in slavery, we seize those, who, in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant lords of the earth."

But alas! for its consistency. In 1816, the General Assembly, while it called slavery a "mournful evil," directed the ERASURE of the note from the eighth commandment. Two years afterwards it adopted an "expression of views," in which slavery is called "a *gross violation* of the most precious and sacred *rights* of human nature," but it only called on the violators of those rights to exert themselves to get rid of slavery "with no greater *delay* than a regard to the public welfare *demands*." But since that time nothing has been done to promote the abolition of slavery.

To how great an extent the Church has become tainted with this crime may be gathered from a declaration of the Rev. J. Smylie, of the Amite Presbytery, Mississippi, in a pamphlet published four or five years since. He says—"If slavery be a sin, and advertising and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the Divine law, and if *the buying, selling, or holding a slave,* FOR THE SAKE OF GAIN, is a heinous sin and scandal, then verily, THREE-FOURTHS OF ALL THE EPISCOPALIANS, METHODISTS, BAPTISTS, and PRESBYTERIANS, in ELEVEN STATES OF THE UNION, are of the devil. They 'hold,' if they do not buy and sell slaves, and *with few exceptions,* they hesitate not to 'apprehend and restore' runaway slaves, when in their power." Such being the case the Church has become powerless for testimony against the sin of slavery.

Last year the Free Church pronounced a heavy condemnation upon American slavery as its exists in practice. You declared that there could be "*no question* as to the HEINOUS SIN involved in the institution of American slavery." But you did not condemn slavery *per se.* You observed, however, that "whatever rights the civil law of the land may give a master over his slaves as *chattels personal,* it cannot but be a sin of the deepest die in him to regard or treat them as such; and whosoever commits that sin in any sense, or deals otherwise with his slaves than a Christian man ought to deal with his fellow-man, whatever power the law may give him over them, ought to be held disqualified for Christian communion." Your condemnation is here levelled against the oppressive slave-master, not against the system which he upholds. You treat the relation between master and slave as innocent: you launch your thunders only against its abuse. At least such is the conclusion to which the Committee have arrived in reviewing your decision. Now, if the enslavement of innocent human beings, and their posterity after them, no matter under what plea, or circumstance, be not *malum in se,* there is an end of the argument; and the principle of judgment must thenceforth be applied, not to the institution, but to the conduct of the individual who abuses it to the injury of his slave. But, in the judgment of the Committee, the institution is itself the greatest abuse. Look at its origin, its tendencies, its results. They bespeak its nature and its opposition to God and goodness. It is absurd, the Committee venture to think, to say that a man may be held as a slave, but not be treated as such; that he may be regarded as chattel personal, but not used as such; that the legal relation may be maintained, but that the rights belonging to it may not be claimed. Slavery they hold to be evil, only evil, and that continually. And in maintaining this view they but assert an old doctrine under which most of the ancient forms of slavery disappeared.

In the *Jus Municipale Magdeburgense*, ascribed to the Emperor Otho the Second, the author, after attempting to show that neither Cain, nor Ham, nor Esau, nor Nimrod, introduced slavery, proceeds thus:—"How could Noah or Isaac bring any one else into slavery when no one can give even himself into slavery? But, in truth, we find slavery to have its origin in war, captivity, oppression; and ancient princes, by custom of long time, have usurped it, as though it were of right, *whereas it is against equity.*—

"For the most High God is believed to have formed man in his own image, and redeemed one as much as another by his passion, and made him free by his glorious blood. *How then can so noble and magnificent a liberty be reduced to slavery?*" The *Jus Provinciale Suevicum*, in a spirit which would do honour to the most enlightened times, asserts that there is nothing in Scripture to sanction slavery; *and prays God to pardon the man who first imposed it on mankind.* The *Speculum Juris Saxonici*, one of the later compilations of German law, observes:—"As far as we can perceive, there is no example of slavery, according to the truth of Holy Scripture and the divine law." . . . . . "The Lord Jesus also, in the temptation of the coin, indicated that no man was the property of another, saying, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' From these words it is collected that man belongs to God; *and he who keeps him in bondage sins against the power of the Almighty.*" These laws were the embodiment of the public sentiment of the times in which they were compiled, and clearly show that sentiment had its origin in the oppugnancy of revealed religion to slavery.

In 1102 a council was held in London by royal authority, at which were present the bishops and abbots of the whole kingdom. They agreed, among others, on the following important canon:—"Let no one henceforward on any account presume to carry on that wicked traffic (nefarium negotium) whereby men hitherto used to be sold in England like brute beasts." In Ireland, "the whole clergy being assembled at Ardagh" (A.D. 1171) went a step further, and decreed "That in all places of the island the English should be released from the chain of servitude and restored to liberty." The traffic in men they had previously condemned as "enormous wickedness." In the times of Wycliffe, "It became a prevailing opinion," says Dr. Henry, "among the people of all ranks that slavery was inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and the rights of humanity, offensive to God, and injurious to man. Wycliffe and his followers," he adds, "inculcated this doctrine with great warmth, and their declamations had a great effect. "And let it be remembered that the recognition and application of the doctrine, that slavery is a sin against God, and ought, therefore, to be abolished, has led to the most triumphant results. It has led to the legal extinction of slavery in every part of the British empire; and is destined, the Committee believe, to overthrow that giant iniquity in the United States. But in order to effect this, there must be no compromise with slave-holders, no recognition of that

spurious Christianity which, while it professes to honour its Divine Founder, wrings from the coerced toil of slaves the means of its support; which affects to feel for the miseries of the heathen abroad, but has no bowels of compassion for those who perish at home.

The Commissioners of the Free Church went to the United States on what was regarded by many as a noble errand; they were welcomed with affectionate respect; and had they confined their mission to the free states they would have been welcomed home again with joy. But they did not do this. They travelled into the slave states; they fellow-shipped with slave-holders; they received their hospitalities, and took their gold to cast it into your treasury. By this act they struck a blow at the very heart of abolition, which has been felt and deplored on both sides the Atlantic. And, not content with this, they have libelled the character of the faithful band of Abolitionists in the United States, and by that means attempted to bring them into disrepute. Had they used as much diligence in making their acquaintance as they did in securing the contributions of slave-holders, the result would have been different; at least they would have been more discriminating, if not more temperate, in their censures. They were warned. The Executive Committee of the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society addressed them a faithful remonstrance, on the 2nd April, 1844, in which they set before them in vivid colours the true character of the slave system in its religious aspects; and affectionately exhorted them to refuse all connexion with it. One paragraph from the address will show its spirit. "The Christian Abolitionists of this land need your aid, dear brethren, in pulling down the strongholds of oppression; and they feel that you will not be sustained by your consciences, or by that numerous and venerated body which you represent, if you directly or indirectly oppose them, by strengthening the hands of their opponents. You will hear the Abolitionists of this country denounced by ministers, elders, and private professors of the Presbyterian Church, as well at the North as the South; but in order to judge how far the denunciations are correct, you will naturally compare their doctrines and measures with the doctrines and measures of the Abolitionists in Great Britain, and not take up an evil report on hearsay, and without due investigation." * * * * * "For twelve years the Abolitionists of this country have been contending with great earnestness, amidst reproach and contumely, not only from the slave-holding states, but from interested politicians, and professing Christians of every denomination, for the poor slaves, our brethren and fellow-countrymen, and for their own rights and privileges, as intended to be secured to them by their constitution and government. Believing that the American Church is the bulwark of American slavery, they have laboured to arouse it to a due sense of its sin, to repentance, and works meet for repentance. Some progress has been made. Our Christian brethren in England, Ireland, and Scotland have aided in the good work by their prayers to God, and their remonstrances with the American Church. With this aid we have sought to sever the unholy alliance subsisting between the slave power and the professed followers of Christ." In concluding their appeal, they say—

"But should you, despite of our friendly warning and urgent Christian remonstrance, solicit money acquired by the sale of American Christians, and men made heathen by the cruel system of slavery, we can only express our firm confidence that your constituents, the Free Church of Scotland, will refuse to receive the polluted silver and gold, and return it to those who gave it."

To the Committee it is a deeply affecting circumstance to find that some men of reputation and standing in the Free Church of Scotland are engaged in defending the slave-holding churches of the United States, by an attempt to prove that slave-holders were admitted to communion in the apostolic churches, and that what they did, the churches of Christ, in these days, may do, and, in point of fact, ought to do.

It has hitherto been one of the chief glories, as well as one of the brightest evidences of the truth of Christianity, that by the force of its principles it has overcome some of the most revolting and bloody practices of ancient times, slavery among the rest; and that were its just and benign precepts universally applied, the crimes which now so deeply afflict and degrade humanity, would speedily disappear. To make this divine system the patron of slavery, because some of its professors practice or wink at the iniquity, is, in the judgment of the Committee, a wickedness scarcely to be paralleled by the sin which it is intended to uphold. Happily the moral sense of the Christian people of this country will not admit of so

---

revolting a plea; and, it may be added, the consciences even of slave-holders themselves will not allow of its validity. But what was the nature of that slavery which, it is affirmed, was sanctioned by the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles? "According to the strict principles of the Roman law," says Mr. Long, "it was a consequence of the relation of master and slave that the master could treat the slave as he pleased; he could sell him, punish him, or put him to death." Slaves were held *pro nullis*, *pro mortuis*, *pro quadrupedibus*, and for worse than even this as A. Faber has shown. As to their practice, "time would fail us," says Potgiesser, "should we recount the various kinds of tortures which the Romans reserved for their slaves alone." Did the Divine Founder of Christianity, or his immediate disciples, sanction this system of guilt and misery? As well might it be said that they sanctioned the bloody gladiatorial shows then prevalent, or the fierce despotism of Nero, under which some of them suffered, because they did not in express words condemn them.

The Committee have been led further than they intended in this communication; but they feel it to be their solemn duty to protest against the proposition that slave-holders, whatever their professions or pretensions, are fit and proper persons to be admitted to the sacred fellowship of the Christian church; and they would earnestly implore you, gentlemen, as the representatives of an influential and important branch of that church, to give forth your testimony to that effect; and by way of giving emphasis to that testimony, to restore the money which in an evil hour your Commissioners were induced to receive from the hands of slave-holders. Gentlemen, had these slave-holders presented to your representatives slaves instead of money, they would have indignantly refused the gift. Yet the money which they received, may have represented, in some instances, the value of men, women, and children,

who had been cruelly deprived of their liberty; or, at all events, the value of their uncompensated toil, a toil wrung from them by the fear or the torture of the whip. Such money comes not with a blessing, but a curse. They would therefore hope that not one farthing of it will ever be allowed to be appropriated to the purposes of the Free Church.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,
On behalf of the Committee,
Yours respectfully,
JOHN SCOBLE, *Secretary.*

NOTE.—Since writing the above, the Committee have received extracts from a sermon preached at Philadelphia, a short time since, by the Rev. Albert Barnes, of the New School Presbyterians, a name deservedly honoured on both sides of the Atlantic, from which they make the following selections:—"Let all evangelical denominations but follow the simple example of the Quakers in this country, and slavery would soon come to an end. There is not vital energy enough—there is not power of influence and numbers enough *out of the church*, to sustain it. Let every religious denomination in the land *detach itself* from all connexion with slavery, without saying a word against others; let the time come when in all the mighty denominations of Christians, it can be announced that *the evil has ceased with them for ever;* and let the voice of each denomination be lifted up in kind but firm and solemn testimony against the system—with no 'mealy' words; with no attempt at apology; with no effort to throw the sacred shield of religion over so great an evil, and the work is done. There is no public sentiment in this land—there could be none created—that would resist such a testimony; there is no power *out* of the Church that could sustain slavery an hour if it were not sustained IN it."

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN ITS RELATION TO AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The course which the Free Church of Scotland has taken, through its official organs, on the subject of American slavery, has deeply grieved many of its best friends. Considering the important position which that church occupies in this country, as one of the authoritative expositors of Christian doctrine and practice, it might have been reasonably expected that she would have spoken out in intelligible language on the monstrous crime which deprives three millions of human beings of their inalienable rights, reduces them to the condition of chattels, and provides for the perpetuation of this atrocious sin in the persons of their innocent offspring. It was believed that a church which could not endure a fetter upon its own limbs, would have been the foremost to have used every legitimate means for striking them off the limbs of the suffering and degraded slave. But she has not done this. At the present moment she sustains, with all the power of her influence and high name, the slave-holders of the United States, and is prepared to welcome such of them as sustain the ministerial office, or are recognised as members of Presbyterian churches, to her pulpits, and the most sacred fellowship of her body.

The discussions which have taken place in Scotland during the two last months, have been of a most exciting and unwonted character. In our small paper it would be impossible to insert a tithe of what has been said and done. We must, therefore, content ourselves with placing on record the most important parts and issues of the controversy; and to express our hope that the Free Church will never be allowed to rest until she has resolved to take her proper position in the great controversy for human rights.

On the 11th of September, 1844, in consequence of certain overtures on the subject of slavery in the United States addressed to the General Assembly by the Synods of Lothian and Tweedale, Glasgow and Ayr, a committee, appointed by that body, gave in a report, from which we make the following extracts:—

"As to the subject of these overtures, the institution of slavery itself, and the continuance or toleration of it in the bosom of a professedly Christian community, the committee are assured that but one feeling prevails among all the members of this church. In its own nature, slavery in all its forms is to be regarded as a system of oppression which cannot be defended. Natural reason, sound policy, a sense of justice between man and man, as well as the whole tenor and spirit of the divine word, and especially of the dispensation of the gospel, concur in condemning it; and it is the glory of Christianity, that hitherto, in proportion to its advancing and prevailing influence, slavery has been mitigated, relaxed, discontinued, and finally extirpated and abolished. It is therefore with the deepest pain that every rightly constituted Christian mind must contemplate the continued and tolerated existence of slavery in the United States of America; and, apart from the feelings which cannot but be called forth by the mere fact of this practice of slavery being allowed in a country making her just boast of the maintenance of equal liberties and equal rights, there are aggravations apparently in the American usage, particularly in the provisions made for the keeping up of the supply of slaves, in the obstacles interposed to their moral and religious education, and in the laws applicable to the protection of the rights of masters, which must characterise American slavery as one of the most deplorable forms of that evil, peculiarly calling for the exertions of a sound Christian philanthropy in regard to it."

This preamble, though couched in measured language, would have been satisfactory, but for the flattery it contains. How a country which tramples on the freedom of millions of human beings can make "her *just* boast of the maintenance of equal liberties and equal rights," is what we cannot conceive; which we do not think that even the astute doctors of the Free Church can satisfactorily explain. But what is the conclusion drawn from this preamble? Is it that the Free Church will have no communion with the abhorred thing or its abettors? No; the report says—

"The committee would bear in mind, that while slavery prevailed in the West Indies, the British churches, both at home and in the colonies, found it no easy matter, in practice, to determine how they ought to deal with it, especially in reference to the exercise of discipline, and the communion of the professing people of God. They would not, indeed, be understood as intimating an opinion that the British churches did all that it was their duty to do against the system of slavery. They believe the reverse. Nor do they mean to indicate any disapprobation of the rule or principle on which some of the American churches now act in opposition to that system; very far from it. All that they intend to suggest is, that the matter admits of, and requires, deliberation, and that the American churches are not to be hastily condemned, especially by those of Britain, because they do not all of them adopt the same practical course of procedure."

This paltering with a grave question of duty, the terms of which have been settled for many years past, in this country, is sad. The committee add:—

"In conclusion, and referring to certain questions which have been raised as to the subsisting intercourse between this church and the Presbyterian churches of America, the committee are of opinion that, *so far as the church is at present advised, there is no reason for interrupting the friendly intercourse so happily begun, and cultivated by reciprocal visits and good offices.*"

Now it is a fact placed beyond all dispute, that the southern sections of the Presbyterian churches in America are steeped up to the very lips in slavery, and the northern sections, with honourable individual exceptions, sustain them in it by still recognising them as living branches in the living vine. Yet the Free Church is proud of the connexion.

The report of the committee was adopted by the General Assembly, and was forwarded to the Rev. George Judkin, D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly, Danville, Kentucky, and the Rev. A. D. Eddy. D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly, Newark, New Jersey, United States, by Dr. Henry Grey, the Moderator of the Free Church.

The course taken by the General Assembly of the Free Church not having given entire satisfaction to many of its supporters, it was deemed necessary in May, 1845, that that venerable body should remove the misunderstandings which existed, and a further report was therefore adopted, the spirit of which will be found in the following extracts:—

"There is no question here as to the heinous sin involved in the institution of American slavery: nor can there be any terms too strong to be employed in pointing out the national guilt which attaches to the continuance of that accursed system, and the national judgments which, under the government of a righteous God, may be expected to mark the divine pleasure against it. Neither can there be any doubt as to the duty incumbent upon all American Christians to exert themselves to the utmost, in every competent way, for the purpose of having it abolished. The only difference of opinion that can exist among the members of this church respects the duty of the churches in America, as churches who are called to deal partially with the evils of slavery, when it forms part of the social system in the community in which they are placed.

"Even as to this matter, it is believed, that the difference is more apparent than real. Without being prepared to adopt the principle that, in the circumstances in which they are placed, the churches in America ought to consider slave-holding as *per se* an insuperable barrier in the way of enjoying Christian privileges, or an offence to be visited with excommunication, all must agree in holding, that whatever rights the civil law of the land may give a master over his slaves, as *chattels personal*, it cannot but be sin of the deepest dye in him to regard or treat them as such; and whosoever commits that sin in any sense, or deals otherwise with his slaves than as a Christian man ought to deal with his fellow-men, whatever power the law may give him over them, ought to be held disqualified for Christian communion. Further, it must be the opinion of all, that it is the duty of Christians, when they find themselves, unhappily, in the predicament of slave-holders, to aim, as far as it may be practicable, at the manumission of their slaves; and, where that cannot be accomplished, to secure them in the enjoyment of the domestic relations, and of the means of religious training and education. And all conduct of a contrary tendency, if persevered in, ought to be visited with the highest ecclesiastical censure, in every Church of Christ. *The only thing which causes hesitation, is the assertion of its being absolutely incumbent on churches thus situated to exclude all slave-holders from their communion.* The committee believe that the church is by no means prepared to assert this to be the duty of the American churches generally; but all that is contained in the above statement, *short of this, which seems to the committee an extremely doubtful position*, they are persuaded that this church will be ready, on every occasion, to maintain, and to urge on the attention of all other churches with which we have any fellowship."

This may appear, at first sight, an improvement on the original deliverance, but when viewed closely, it is not so. In the former deliverance slavery itself is condemned, as "in its own nature," and "in all its forms," "a system of oppression which cannot be defended." Here the terms are changed: the system is not condemned, so much as its abuses. Simple slave-holding may consist with fidelity to Christ, and with an honourable standing in his church. Whenever the slave-holder does not regard or treat his slaves as *property*, he is innocent. Is not this solemn trifling? So long as he sustains the legal relation they are property; they form part of his assets to meet his debts should he prove unfortunate in his affairs; and, unless he divest himself of the relation, when he dies, they descend to his heirs, or are disposed of to pay legacies, or, it may be, to aid in the diffusion of Christian truth in the world. The crime, in our judgment, is in the holding of man as property. If you do not play the tyrant with them—if you clothe, and lodge, and feed them well, you still wrong them, grievously wrong them. You deprive them of all civil immunities, of the protection of law as freemen, of the right to dispose of themselves in such a manner as to advance their own interests, in their own way. You, their fellow-men, keep them in a state of tutelage and dependence; and should any misfortune or accident overtake you, you expose them to all the horrors of separation and sale, and to all the sufferings and degradation of that state which you pronounce innocent, because you do not oppress them. But you are criminal in another sense: you sanction, by your relation as a slave-holder, the whole system of American slavery, with all its horrible and debasing incidents. An innocent slave-holder is a solecism in terms; as well might you call an infidel a Christian. The report goes on to state:—

"The committee might further observe, that the real question which has been raised, so far as the conduct of this church is concerned, is, not whether the American churches ought, or ought not, to refuse the privilege of their communion to all slave-holders—nor whether they are, or

are not, as faithful as they should and might be, in exercising discipline against all the moral offences, and all the cruelty and neglect, which the existence of that relation is apt to cause—nor whether they are doing all that they should and might do to influence public opinion and the legislative counsels, with a view to the abolition of this nationally sinful system; but whether this church, having been brought, in God's providence, into intercourse with these churches, as regards the interchange of brotherly sympathy and aid, is bound to refuse the tokens of their attachment which their people have given, and to renounce and repudiate all further friendly correspondence with them, or is not rather at liberty, and under an obligation, to continue to cultivate a good understanding with them; taking care always to do so for the very purpose of faithfully exhorting and admonishing them to a full discharge of their duty, in this matter, to themselves and their country, as well as to the oppressed, and that God who hears their cry. Nor, if you stop short of the adoption of the extreme principle already adverted to, which raises some difficult questions and scruples, on scriptural and moral grounds, is there any extent of anxious entreaty and remonstrance to which this church ought not to be prepared to go, in dealing with those who are placed in such difficult circumstances, in order that they may be found faithful."

There is something more specious than sound in all this. The Free Church voluntarily seeks association with churches tainted with the guilt of slavery, receives their contributions into its treasury, and finding it difficult to retrace its steps, becomes encumbered with "difficult questions and scruples, on scriptural and moral grounds," and therefore continues the connexion and retains the money. It would be more manly at once to say, "We believe that Christianity and slavery are perfectly compatible with each other, that the relation of slave-holder may be maintained with a 'conscience void of offence towards God and towards man;' and, therefore, we will war not with the system but with its abuses, and honour with our confidence and love every good slave-holding Presbyterian in the United States. We will have no tests of fellowship which will shut out from our communion dear and valued Christian brethren."

But we must now furnish specimens of the reply of the American Presbyterians to the communication of the Free Church, of the 11th Sept. 1844. The answer bears date the 27th May, 1845. After the respondents had expressed their gratification "with the spirit of candour and inquiry which pervades the document on the subject of slavery," forwarded to them, they define their position in the following terms:—

"We dare not contract the bond of union among brethren more than Christ has contracted it, nor exclude from the pale of communion members that *merely hold a relation which Christ and his Apostles did not declare, among the many specific declarations against prevailing sins, to be incompatible with Christian fellowship.* Slavery existed then as well as now, with at least equal atrocity; and in our opposition to its evils we desire to treat it as they did, rather than reduce their broad precepts to that minute kind of legislation which engenders fanaticism, distracts and enfeebles the church, and defeats the eventual triumph of the very principles it proposes to enforce."

Now this may be very fine writing, but to us it is not very clear. We believe the "broad principles" of Christ and his Apostles are not wide enough to cover slavery either Roman or American; and that were they faithfully applied, they would sweep the infamous institution from the face of the earth. But these good Presbyterians tell the Free Church that it is their "determination to abide by the example of Christ and his Apostles," as they understand it; and transmit with their letter a copy of resolutions passed at their General Assembly "with great unanimity and deliberate firmness." Here they are:

"Resolved, 1st, That the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, *was originally organized, and has since continued the bond of union in the church upon the* CONCEDED *principle that the existence of domestic slavery, under the circumstances in which it is found in the southern portion of the country, is no bar to Christian communion.*

"2nd, That the petitions that ask the assembly to make the holding of slaves in itself a matter of discipline, do virtually require this judicatory to dissolve itself, and abandon the organization under which, by the divine blessing, it has so long prospered. The tendency is evidently to separate the northern from the southern portion of the church; a result which every good citizen must deplore as tending to the dissolution of the union of our beloved country, and which every enlightened Christian will oppose, as bringing about a ruinous and unnecessary schism between brethren who maintain a common faith."

These resolutions were preceded by a long preamble, full of negatives and assumptions, the drift of which is to prove that slavery is not necessarily sinful. They say—"This assembly cannot denounce the holding of slaves as necessarily a heinous and scandalous sin, calculated to bring upon the church the curse of God, *without charging the apostles of Christ with conniving at such sin, introducing into the church such sinners, and thus bringing upon themselves the curse of the Almighty.*" They then echo the doctrine of the Free Church, but in somewhat feebler tones, that "there is no denying that there is evil connected with slavery," such as "the traffic in slaves *for gain*; the separation of husbands and wives and children *for the sake of filthy lucre;* and the cruel treatment of slaves." The assembly, further, would not have it understood that they countenance "the idea that masters may regard their servants as *mere property*, and not as human beings, rational, accountable, immortal." Of course not; that were to outrage common sense, as well as Christianity. They do not countenance the idea of their being *mere property*, such as a table or a tree, an ox, or an ass, but as men-property — the highest kind of property — they have no objection to that. And when they object to "the traffic in slaves *for gain*," or the separation of husbands and wives and children *for the sake of filthy lucre*," they have no objection to their being sold *for purposes of charity:* To endow theological academies, for instance, or to maintain the ministry, or to carry the gospel to the heathen. The end, in these cases, sanctifies the means. Let it not be said that we libel the pro-slavery churches of the United States when we say this. We can prove it. They go on to observe: "The assembly *intend simply to say, that since Christ and his inspired apostles did not make the holding of slaves a bar to communion, we, as a court of Christ, have no authority to do so; since they did not attempt to remove it from the church by legislation, we have no authority to legislate on the subject.*"

We will not trust ourselves to comment on this presumptuous statement; but we feel persuaded that it would not have been allowed to have passed current in the dark ages, either as sound doctrine, or as scriptural fact. It is worthy of a pro-slavery church, the chief source of whose wealth is in slaves, or the produce of slaves; and ought not to be tolerated by any branch of the Christian church, which recognises the pure and elevating doctrines, the just and holy precepts, and the benign and merciful spirit of its great Master and Lord.

We come now to the recent action of the Free Church on the subject of American slavery. Overtures having been read in the General Assembly from the Synod of Sutherland and Caithness, and from the Synod of Angus and Mearns, &c., Drs. Candlish, Duncan, Cunningham, and others, spoke at great length in support of affirming the ground already taken by the Free Church. Mr. Macbeth, on the contrary, submitted a resolution, which pledged the assembly not to admit to its pulpits, or to the communion table, any individual from the United States by whom slavery

is practised; nor to receive deputations from any church which does not visit slave-holding members with excommunication. Mr. Macbeth's proposition fell to the ground for want of a seconder, and the whole subject was remitted to a committee, to draft a letter to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. This letter was prepared, read, and adopted on the 2nd June last, and is as follows:—

After preamble, the letter proceeds thus:—

"It is not with a view to a prolonged and exciting discussion between you and us, far less with anything like a desire to bring about ultimate severance, that we again return, in a few sentences, to a subject which has already forced itself into our communications with one another. But we feel assured that you, as well as we, would be ashamed of any unmanly shrinking, on either side, from a free exchange of sentiment on such a topic; and in faithfulness, but with all affection, we must express to you our views.

"Upon most, if not all, of the general principles upon which you, as a church, appear to regulate your conduct, you and we are very much agreed; we are agreed in our sense of the evils of slavery, as well as in the conviction that masters may not 'regard their servants as *mere property*, instead of human beings, rational, accountable, immortal;' and that 'every Christian and philanthropist should seek, by all peaceable and lawful means, the repeal of unjust and oppressive laws respecting slavery'—and we presume, also, the abolition of slavery itself. We learn also, with satisfaction, that 'the ministers and churches in the slave-holding states are awaking to a deeper sense of their obligation to extend to the slave population generally the means of grace.' That you 'by no means countenance the traffic of slaves for the sake of gain; the separation of husbands and wives, parents and children, for the sake of 'filthy lucre,' or for the convenience of masters, or the cruel treatment of slaves in any respect,'—we firmly believe, and indeed never doubted. On the other hand, we do not concur in opinion with those who think that the mere fact of slave-holding should in itself, under all circumstances, be considered as a heinous sin, calling for the discipline of the church, and who would require us to renounce all friendly intercourse with you, and to offend and insult you, by rejecting the tokens of your sympathy with us in our trials, because you do not act upon that principle in your government of Christ's house according to his Word. We have reason, also, to apprehend, from recent experience in our own country, that the 'indiscriminate denunciations' of which you speak, have a tendency only 'to perpetuate and aggravate the evils which they profess to remedy.'

"At the same time, we cannot conceal from you, that in some particulars we are constrained to differ from you. You will permit us, we are confident, to address you with all frankness, and you will bear with us when we express our fear, that you may possibly have been led, by the circumstances in which you are placed, to contemplate, with somewhat diminished abhorrence, a system which no Christian man or Christian church can fail to condemn. It is the unhappy tendency of such a position as you occupy—in the midst of the institutions of slavery—that it almost inevitably leads to a less sensitive tone of feeling in regard to them; and we are fully aware that the extravagant and extreme opinions of some of the Abolitionists in your country have compelled you to make explanations upon this subject, which may be easily perverted into an apparent apology for the system. We suffer with you in this respect, and we have not been moved, nor will we allow ourselves to be moved, by mere clamour, from what we believe to be scriptural, as well as brotherly position in our relation towards you. But looking on from a distance, and out of the reach of some of the influences to which you are

exposed, we may suggest for consideration, whether more might not be done for the great cause of the abolition of slavery by yourselves, in whose hands it would be safer and more successful than in the hands of many of its present advocates.

"You seem to us to take a view different from ours of the duty of the Christian church in dealing with the civil and domestic regulations of the state, one of which you say is slavery. Like you, we disclaim all right, on the part of the church, to legislate for the commonwealth, or dictate to its rulers, and we hold that, ordinarily, the alternative upon which Christians, as such, have to decide, is between obeying the law, if the Word of God permit obedience, or if not, taking the risk of disobeying it. We believe, however, that it is often the church's duty to testify to the state, and remonstrate with it, in regard to evils which it may be sanctioning or tolerating; more especially when these evils are so flagrantly in violation of the spirit of the gospel, and so inconsistent with the due discharge of its duties, as slavery, in every form, is. We cannot but think that the church and its members, as such, lie under an obligation to aim strenuously at their mitigation and removal. There are some things connected with slavery, as it is alleged to exist among you, which, so far as we could judge, would render it almost impossible to abstain from moving against it. We refer to the legal obstacles interposed in the way of teaching the young, the frequent, if not customary, violation of the marriage relation; and the difficulty or impossibility, as the law now stands, of the practice of emancipation. Thus, if the law forbids the teaching of the young, is the church, we would respectfully ask, to obey the law or break it? In either case it is surely alike her duty and her right to seek an alteration of a law so tyrannical and antichristian. So also in regard to the marriage relation. We cannot but regard the position of your ministers who are called to perform the marriage ceremony among a population liable to have the marriage tie so loosely formed, and so cruelly broken, as one demanding on the part of the church whose ministers they are, most vigorous and persevering exertions in dealing with the legislatures of these states, with a view to have the abominations of such a system speedily brought to an end. And considering the obstacles interposed in the slave states to the voluntary manumission of slaves by their masters, or the purchase of their liberty by other parties, and the necessity thus laid on many to continue against their will in the relation of masters of slaves, we confess that it seems to us that the churches of America ought to lift up their voices more loudly, and put forth their energies more vigorously, than now they do, for the abolition of a system which not only is in itself contrary to the spirit of God's Word and the natural rights of man, but, as it would appear by the practical confession of its very supporters, can be upheld only by perpetuating ignorance, tampering with the domestic charities, and virtually prohibiting the influence of those enlightened and Christian feelings of benevolence which otherwise might speedily lead to the breaking of every yoke, and the letting of the oppressed go free.

"It is not for us to dictate to you as to the way in which the discipline of a Christian church ought to be brought to bear upon the holding or the having of slaves. While we are by no means prepared to say, that the mere fact of a man's standing in the legal relation of the master or owner of a slave is in itself, and without respect to circumstances, an offence to be visited with censure, we are inclined to regard it as in every case a position requiring to be explained and justified, on the part of him who is placed in it, by a clear plea of necessity or mercy. Wherever there is slavery there is sin; and the party who holds, or possesses, or owns a slave, must be presumed to be a sinner, unless it can be shown that it is not through his fault that he is a slave-master, and that he cannot, consistently with his duty, cease to be so. We are clearly of opinion,

also, that no Christian man, however in the eye of the law he may stand in the relation of a master to a slave, can consider himself as really standing in that relation, either in the eye of conscience or in the eye of God; and we feel assured that a professing Christian holding himself entitled, or acting as if he held himself entitled, to regard and treat his fellow-immortal as if he were—what the law may make him in the judgment of human tribunals, but never in that of God—a piece of goods or chattels, sins grievously, and ought to be subjected to discipline of kindness at first, and the discipline of utmost severity at last. These principles we pray you to excuse us for humbly bringing forward on this occasion, that we may stir up your minds by way of remembrance, and that we may exonerate ourselves in this matter.

"In conclusion, allow us to suggest, with all tenderness, for your consideration, the fearful and appalling risk, as its appears to us, that indecision and delay in such a crisis must involve. Were the great cause of emancipation in our country at once and promptly taken up by Christian churches and Christian men, not on any minute question of ecclesiastical order or ecclesiastical relations, but on the broad general principles of religion and humanity, upon which, in our country, the contest was waged and the victory won,—were those who cannot adopt extreme views on the subject to rally around them a noble band of the true friends of the slave, and make a grand united movement against this monstrous national iniquity, your legislative bodies might yet listen to Scripture and to reason, and a peaceful settlement of this agitating controversy might yet be possible. It is not for us to anticipate the opposite alternative of the violence of unwise friends of the cause, making prudent men inactive, and goading the oppressed to madness. May the Lord himself show the path of light! and may he so raise up and qualify witnesses for his truth, and champions of the poor and needy, that the field may be taken and the banner unfurled by them that fear him, so as to leave neither room nor occasion for that wrath of man which worketh not the righteousness of God."

The matter will not be allowed to stop here. There is a moral power in the Free Church which will compel Drs. Candlish, Cunningham, and Duncan, to act in accordance with the spirit of the times, and, what is more, in the *spirit of their Divine Master*.

For the present the Free Church of Scotland refuses to return the money which has been cast into her treasury by the slave-holders of the United States. Counselled by Drs. Candlish, Cunningham, and Duncan, she has resolved to continue her connexion with slave-holders, and to offer them her pulpits, and a free participation in her most sacred rites. This is very sad; and could we believe that the doctrines propounded by these reverend gentlemen were embraced by any large portion of the Free Church, it would be very alarming. For it would, if true, deprive the slave of his most cherished hope, and the advocate of the slave of his keenest weapon—namely, that slavery is, in itself, essentially criminal. The slave in the United States builds his hope of deliverance from bondage, on the presumption that his master, whether professedly Christian or infidel, has no right to his person, to his offspring—wife he is not permitted to have—or to his labour; that, in point of fact, he is his own, and that no man, under any pretext whatsoever, has any authority to deprive him of his liberty, or to hold him as a slave. The advocate of the slave presses the same doctrine on the conscience of the slave-holder, and in that conscience, unless indurated by long-continued crime, or quieted by the metaphysics and casuistry of doctors of divinity, his plea is admitted to be valid; and necessity only is set up by him in justification or palliation of his evil deed.

Slavery is not in itself sinful, say the Scottish doctors, though it may involve sin; for, say they, Christ and his apostles did not denounce or condemn it, or exclude from fellowship those who practised it, which they would undoubtedly have done had it been a criminal institution. Hence, Christians may sustain the relation of slave-holders without impeachment of their character; and be as innocent of wrong as if they fully recognised the right of their slaves to liberty, and treated them, in all respects, as their fellow-men, and their equals before the law.

In opposition to this, we believe that God hath created all men equal, and endowed them with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that whoever deprives any human being of the one or the other, is the enemy of man, and a traitor to God. And we further believe, that what the common sense and conscience of mankind asserts upon this subject, the word of God ratifies.

It is unnecessary, we suppose, that there should be an express denunciation of so enormous an evil as slavery. Why, long before the advent of the Saviour into the world, or the teachings of the apostles, slavery was considered to be one of the greatest calamities that could befall the human race; and the enslavement of free-men regarded and punished as a crime. Originally slaves were captives made in war, whose lives were forfeited, according to the military codes of those times. Death was commuted into the loss of liberty, and slavery, at length, became an organized system, detestable in all its features, and atrocious in its practice.

As a state or condition it was universally condemned; and the uses which Christ and his apostles made of it and its opposite, freedom, to shadow forth the blessings of the gospel on the one hand, or the fearful results of sin on the other, abundantly prove this. There was no necessity for an express condemnation of slavery, as it had already been condemned by the general voice of mankind.

But then, it is asserted, that slave-holders were admitted to the fellowship of the Christian Church. We simply deny this, and ask for the proof, if it exist. It will not do to infer it from the instructions given to masters and servants. Neither will it do to produce the case of Philemon. On a subject of such vital importance as this, we demand the most clear and unexceptionable evidence. That evidence, we feel assured, cannot be produced. Apply the great principles of righteousness and love which Christ taught, and which his apostles inculcated, and what becomes of slavery? Even the Scottish doctors admit, that were they applied to American slavery it would instantly cease. Now we infer that they were applied in the days of the apostles, and we should dishonour them, to suppose the contrary. We believe that both the Jewish and Gentile churches planted by their instrumentality, were free from the taint of slavery. That slaves were members of the primitive Church there can be no doubt, but that slave-holders were, there is not, in our judgment, the tittle of evidence to prove.

But it is not our intention to argue the question here. Other opportunities will be afforded us of bringing this matter in a complete form before our readers. In the meantime we ask them to read the memorial addressed to the Moderator and Members of the Free Church, by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, inserted in our present number, as the ground on which that body earnestly recommends to them the duty of "sending back the money." We would also call their attention to the article "on the FreeChurch of Scotland in its relation to American Slavery," which will also be found in our columns. That article embodies the official decisions of the Free Church up to its latest deliverance, in justification of its relation with slave-holders.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SLAVERY,

UNITED STATES.—That our readers may have some idea of the vigorous manner in which the domestic slave-trade is carried on in the United States, we give below an exact copy of sixteen advertisements taken from one single Southern paper, the *Daily Southern Intelligencer*, of March 16, 1846, published at Vicksburg, Mississippi.

NEGROES! NEGROES!!—The undersigned pay particular attention to the purchase and sale of negroes, and persons wishing to purchase slaves, or having them to sell, will find it to their interest to give us a call. Field hands and house servants of both sexes, for sale by—Livingston, Hanna, and Co., Auctioneers and General Agents, No. 374, Washington-street.

NEGROES! NEGROES! NEGROES!—We have on hand several valuable negro men, at prices running from $515 to $650, thorough-bred and likely field hands; also, two excellent cooks and house-servants, one cook, washer and ironer at $425; also, several boys and girls. Persons wishing to purchase slaves, either for field use or as house servants, will please call on us. We are constantly in the market, and those having negroes can always effect sale through us.—Livingston, Hanna, and Co.

FOR HIRE.—A family of NEGROES for the ensuing year, consisting of a man, and wife, and four children. The man is a first-rate blacksmith and drayman, the woman a fine cook and house-servant. Bond, with approved security, will be required for their hire.—Apply to Livingston, Hanna, and Co.

New York Auction, and Real Estate Mart, No. 374, Washington-street, south of the Post-office.—The following is a list of NEGROES now on hand and for sale, and we are daily receiving orders to effect sales for more. One negro man, aged 46 years, a good ostler; one family, consisting of one man, and woman, and two children; one negro boy, aged seventeen years, a good shoemaker, and capital house-boy; one boy, aged twelve years, remarkably smart; one negro woman, aged thirty-one years, a good cook; fifteen likely negroes, of both sexes and various ages, suitable for field hands and house servants. We intend devoting particular attention to the purchase and sale of negroes, and persons having negroes to sell, or wishing to buy, will find it to their advantage to give us a call. Being well acquainted in the city and surrounding counties, we can give the fullest satisfaction to those who favour us with a call.—Livingston, Hanna, and Co.

NEGROES IN THE MARKET.—We have for sale a very likely NEGRO woman, thirty-five years of age, good house-servant, and indefatigable field hand. Also, her daughter, fourteen years old, good house girl and field hand, acclimated, and title fully guaranteed. Also, a negro woman, aged twenty-six, a first-rate cook, washer and ironer; and her infant child. These negroes are all highly recommended, and the titles clear.—Livingston, Hanna, and Co.

AUCTION SALES.—At the city auction room every Wednesday and Saturday, at 10 o'clock, a.m. Particular attention paid to the sale of NEGROES. Real and personal property of every

description; trust and administrator's sales attended to on liberal terms, by D. Hansbrough & Co., Washington-street, a few doors north of Thatcher's Hotel.

FOR SALE.—At city auction room, one likely NEGRO man, good drayman, and can make himself generally useful. Can be seen at any time. Title good. D. Hansbrough & Co.

VALUABLE NEGROES FOR SALE.—At the city auction room. One splendid house woman, good cook, washer and ironer, aged about 25 years, active and sound; one second rate do; one valuable house-girl, aged 14 years. Bargains may be had if early application is made. Titles indisputable. D. Hansbrough and Co.

FOR HIRE.—Two good house-girls, 17 and 18 years old. Apply at the city auction room. D. Hansbrough & Co.

HOUSE SERVANT.—A likely house-woman for sale, at the city auction room; also a lot of clocks, cheaper than ever. Chairs, bedsteads, &c. For sale cheap, to close consignment, by D. Hansbrough & Co.

FOR SALE.—A valuable NEGRO boy, aged about 19 years, good cook and house servant, good gardener, &c.; can make himself generally useful. Apply to D. Hansbrough & Co.

BLACKSMITHS FOR SALE.—A Bargain.—A valuable young NEGRO man, good blacksmith, with good set of tools, will be sold cheap. Title clear. D. Hansbrough & Co.

FOR SALE CHEAP.—One splendid house-girl, 14 years old. Come quick, or you miss a bargain. D. Hansbrough & Co.

WANTED TO HIRE.—10 good farm hands, for which liberal prices will be paid. Apply at the city auction room.

FOR SALE.—A valuable NEGRO man; good field hand; aged 33 years. City auction room.

NEGRO BLANKETS.—10 different qualities of NEGRO blankets on hand and for sale cheap. Yes, very low, by Judson and Robinson.

PAULINE.—The following frightful illustration of slavery is extracted from the *Essex* (United States) *Transcript*:—Many of our readers have probably seen a paragraph stating that a young slave-girl was recently hanged at New Orleans for the crime of striking and abusing her mistress. The religious press of the north has not, so far as we are aware, made any comments upon this execution. It is too busy pulling the mote out of the eye of the heathen, to notice the beam in our nominal Christianity at home. Yet this case, viewed in all its aspects, is an atrocity which has, God be thanked, no parallel in heathen lands. It is a hideous offshoot of American Republicanism and American Christianity. It seems that Pauline—a young and beautiful girl—attracted the admiration of her master, and being, to use the words of the law, his "chattel personal to all intents and purposes whatsoever" became the victim of his lust. So wretched is the condition of the slave-woman, that even the brutal and licentious regard of her master is looked upon as the highest exaltation of which her lot is susceptible. The slave-girl, in this instance, evidently so regarded it; and, as a natural consequence, in her new condition triumphed over and insulted her mistress; in other words, repaid in some degree the scorn and abuse with which her mistress had made her painfully familiar. The laws of the Christian State of Mississippi

inflict the punishment of death upon the slave who lifts his or her hand against a white person. Pauline was accused of beating her mistress, tried, and found guilty, and condemned to die. But it was discovered on the trial that she was in a condition to become a mother, and her execution was delayed until the birth of the child. She was conveyed to the prison-cell. There, for many weary months, uncheered by the voice of kindness, alone, hopeless, desolate, she waited for the advent of the new and quickening life within her, which was to be the signal of her own miserable death. And the bells there called to mass and prayer-meeting, and Methodists sang, and Baptists immersed, and Presbyterians sprinkled, and young mothers smiled through tears upon their new-born children; and maidens and matrons of that great city sat in their cool verandahs and talked of love and household joys and domestic happiness; while all that dreary time the poor slave-girl lay on the scanty straw of her dungeon, waiting—with what agony the great and pitying God of the white and the black only knows! —for the birth of the child of her adulterous master. Horrible! Was ever what George Sand justly terms "the great martyrdom of maternity"—that fearful trial which love alone converts into joy unspeakable—endured under such conditions? What was her substitute for the kind voices and gentle soothings of affection? The harsh grating of her prison lock—the mockings and taunts of unfeeling and brutal keepers! What with the poor Pauline took the place of the hopes and joyful anticipations which support and solace the white mother, and make her couch of torture happy with sweet dreams? The prospect of seeing the child of her sorrow, of feeling its lips upon her bosom, of hearing its feeble cry—alone, unvisited of its unnatural father; and then in a few days, just when the mother's affections are strongest, and the first smile of her infant compensates for the pangs of the past—the scaffold and the hangman! Think of that last terrible scene—the tearing of the infant from her arms, the death-march to the gallows, the rope around her delicate neck, and her long and dreadful struggles (for, attenuated and worn by physical suffering and mental sorrow, her slight frame had not sufficient weight left to produce the dislocation of her neck, on the falling of the drop) swinging there alive for nearly half-an-hour, a spectacle for fiends in the shape of humanity. Mothers of New England! such are the fruits of slavery. Oh! in the name of the blessed God, teach your children to hate it, and to pity its victims. Petty politicians and empty-headed Congress debaters are vastly concerned lest the "honour of the country" should be compromised in the matter of the Oregon boundary. Fools! One such horrible atrocity as this murder of poor Pauline "compromises" us too deeply to warrant any further display of their patriotism. It would compromise Paradise itself. An intelligent and philanthropic European gentleman, who was in New Orleans at the time of the execution, in a letter to a friend in this vicinity, after detailing the circumstances of the revolting affair, exclaims, "God of goodness! God of justice! There must be a future state to redress the wrongs of this. I am almost tempted to say, there must be a future state, or no God.

162 171

THE *GUARDIAN* AND THE EDINBURGH TOWN COUNCIL, AND GEORGE THOMPSON.

Some of the rabid Free churchmen in the Edinburgh Town Council are desperately chagrined at the Freedom of that City having been conferred on Mr George Thompson; and they have taken an opportunity, this week, in the absence of Mr Thompson—after his back has been turned—to vent out their bile against him. They had not the free courage to do this in the Council when Mr Thompson appeared there. Their reasons for being silent in the Council when he was amongst them are sufficiently obvious—Thompson would have floored them with their own vellum in his hands!

But the *Guardian* of yesterday is in ecstasy at this stab in the back, as we might call it, against Thompson; and it calls loudly upon him "*to send back the Edinburgh presentation.*"

Now, we are no particular friends of Mr Geo. Thompson. We never met with him; and have had no communication with him whatever. But if we were on the most intimate habits of friendship with him—if we were his advisers, or could give him the least counsel, we would instantly advise him to send some such challenge as the following to the *Guardian*, and to *Lawyer Lothian*, who leads the "free" in the Edinburgh Council. Let him challenge them to meet him in public meeting in all the Electoral Wards of the city of Edinburgh. Let the representatives of these wards be invited to attend, face to face; and let the question be put and decided at these meetings, whether the *freedom* should be withdrawn or not? Let Drs Candlish and Cunningham be there to see. Aye, let them be there to see and to *hear*, if they please. And then Thompson, if he be defeated, will have the magnanimity, we hope, "to send back the *Presentation.*" But will they have the magnanimity, or the honesty, to send back the Dollars?

This affords Thompson an excellent opportunity, to say the least of it, for following up his well-directed blows. The *Guardian* falsely insinuated that he had ran away from Edinburgh—never to return. But he came back, and smote them hip and thigh: and if he comes back again, he may smite them with his *Presentation* to their heart's content. He has made some of them so very black in the face already, that we doubt whether they would venture to meet him on any platform. At ll events, he may silence their incipient cry to end back the Presentation, but they can never ilence his thundering one to send back the Dolars, till they have actually done so.

We have received various interesting communications respecting the "agitation" now raised, or attempted to be raised, against the Free Church, on the subject of American slavery. But it does not seem requisite at present to dwell farther on that matter.

The *Argus*, we observe, thinks fit to lecture us, on the *disingenuousness* of our representing that there has been any sort of "agitation" against the Free Church, on this subject!—declaring that, "*so far as he is aware*," there has been *no such thing as* "*agitation!*" and that it becomes us, therefore, "to avoid *such tactics*," and to "reflect on *the truthfulness* of our proceedings." In answer to all which, we have simply to assert that the "agitation" attempted, has been of the most bare-faced, virulent, and offensive kind. Such, we apprehend, it has plainly been in the eyes of all the world; and that is our opinion of it,—which we shall not alter, even to obtain the favour of the *Argus*, or of any "well-wishers," such as the *Argus* has either *professed* or *proved* himself to be.

The proceedings of the Edinburgh Town Council (given in other columns) are instructive. It appears that the vote to confer the freedom of the city on Mr. George Thompson was not only passed by a *minority* of the Council, but was obtained by means of a gross surprise practised upon the body. Last year, when it was privately proposed to confer the freedom of the city on Dr. Merle D'Aubigne, the Lord Provost objected, because "he feared it would raise the question of partiality for the Free Church, and would be sure to give great offence to the Established party." But this nice and sensitive delicacy—for which, in the circumstances of last year, there were really no substantial grounds—is now, by the very same functionary, given entirely to the winds, in circumstances where the offence, occasioned to a religious body, is of the grossest and most palpable kind. So strong is the impropriety of the late proceeding felt, upon reflection, to be, that Mr. Councillor Russell—who took an active part in procuring the vote, and is anything rather than a Free Churchman—now declares, "*I confess, on a review of the proceedings of the Town Council, I have cause to regret the course I took upon that occasion.*" And he went on to say, "The language employed by Mr. Thompson, in describing a body of men whom I am accustomed to consider as embracing a great amount of the piety and philanthropy of the land, *was unworthy both of his former reputation and of the cause in which he was engaged*," and "I cannot but *contrast the calm, dignified conduct of Dr. Cunningham in the General Assembly of the Free Church, with the sort of clap trap proceedings of the other party*," * * and "with the language, *so abusive* and *so vituperative*, which they have used against the Free Church," and that, too, in addressing themselves to audi-

very little consequence;—but upon the whole, we rather think there would be less disgrace in rejecting, than in retaining an "honour," so conferred.

PECCAVI.

"We (*Guardian*) have received various *interesting* "communications respecting the 'agitation' now raised, "or attempted to be raised, against the Free Church, "on the subject of American slavery. *But it does not* "*seem requisite at present to dwell farther on that mat-* "*ter.*"—*Vide Guardian of yesterday.*

Aye, aye—this is the way to give the go-by to the agitation, not against the Free Church, but against the foul dollars. "It does not (quoth the *Guardian*) seem requisite at present to dwell farther on *that* matter." Thus the "free" are obliged, at least, to cry—Peccavi; to sing dumb "on *that* matter."

But the matter itself has gone to the hearts, and, let us hope, to the consciences also, of the really free people of Scotland. They can never forget it: and the escutcheon of this so-called "Free" Church is blackened for ever with one of the most abominable transactions that ever disgraced humanity.

"SEND BACK THE MONEY."

THE SAINTLY SCOUNDREL AGAIN!!!

To the Editor of the "Scotch Reformers' Gazette."

SIR,—Would you be so kind as inform me if discipline has ever been inflicted upon the *Saintly Elder of* Mr Lewis—I mean *Captain Knox Trotter of Ballendean!!!*—whose subscriptions are announced in the subscription list, in the *Witness*, of contributions to the New Church to be built by the Free Secession, *in honour* of JOHN KNOX!!! Surely this money ought to be sent back, although they keep the slave money.

The *outlawed* scoundrel signs himself A DESCENDANT OF JOHN KNOX!!! Many of the parties engaged in receiving subscriptions for the monument must have known of it, as he gives the names of his wife and children immediately below.—Your obedt. servant,

ANTI-HUMBUG.

THE NEWCASTLE GUARDIAN

SATURDAY, JULY 11, 1846.

EDITORIAL NOTICES.

THE SLAVERY CONTROVERSY.—Our table is literally covered with letters on this subject, all (with one exception) congratulating us on our advocacy of the Negro's cause, and condemning, in no measured terms, the false step taken by the Free Church. The exception mentioned is from "a Free Churchman" who declines to give his name, and, on that account, is reluctantly omitted. We say reluctantly, because the letter is very respectfully and temperately written; but, in a case where facts are in dispute, we must have the name of the author. Among the most earnest of our correspondents, we notice not a few of the Society of Friends—a body that has always been conspicuous in contending, through good and bad report, for civil and religious liberty, and for whose good wishes on this and other occasions, we feel especially grateful.

THE NEWCASTLE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—This society, we are informed, has invited Mr Geo. Thompson, the celebrated lecturer, to deliver an address at a public meeting to be held here on an early day. Mr Frederick Douglass, "the runaway slave," whose narrative is reviewed in our sixth page, has also consented to visit Newcastle as soon as his other engagements will permit, to lecture on American slavery.

THE PLEA OF THE PRESS—AMERICAN SLAVERY—AND THE FREE CHURCH.

We were told on Tuesday night, that the Press must be reformed; and this, considered in its connection, we regard as intended to humble ourselves in particular, beneath a sense of our own miserable depravity. That depravity, we are plainly apprised, consists, or is made manifest, in our cruelty towards the Free Church of Scotland! Now, we take leave, once for all, to deny, that there ever was, or is now, the shadow of a shade of a desire to injure the interests of any church as such. To the Free Church in particular, we have always accorded, and yet accord, very much of honour and credit. We hold that many of her ministers have sacrificed nobly, and done great things, for the cause of Religion and Freedom in these lands. Had we thought otherwise—had our prejudice permitted us to hate, or our pride allowed us to contemn the church in question, we should have left her to live as she list, and recked nothing whether she stood or fell. It is because, in many respects, we admired her beginning; because, in other respects, we applaud her subsequent career, that we have come to the resolution of not allowing her ignominiously to perish, if any act of ours, be it for the present painful or pleasing, will avail for her deliverance. Thus much in reply to the charge of personal pique against either the church or its mem-

bers. Henceforth let no man trouble us with the accusation. We shall smile at the libel, and pass on. Now for the meeting on Tuesday night.

The speeches of the evening were those of the Rev. J. Macnaughtan, and the Rev. W. Wallace Duncan. The remainder may be regarded, without disrespect, as merely supplementary, and only introduced to guard against the appearance of that which would otherwise have been even more manifest than it was, viz., that the whole was a scheme for allowing the Free Churchmen present an opportunity to defend their leaders; or, in the words of Mr Macnaughtan's disclaimer, to put the Free Church "on its trial." Lest it should surprise any one to whom the last-named rev. gentleman was previously a stranger, that a meeting whose platform was denied the countenance of every minister in the town not of the Free Church or its offshoot in England, nevertheless escaped with comparatively slight interruption from the friends of the Negro—two things must be borne in mind; first, that all claims to a rejoinder were peremptorily disallowed by the Chairman; and, secondly, that Mr Macnaughtan had previously contrived, by two clever strokes of policy, to enlist in his favour, as a man, many who would have refused him a hearing as the apologist of pro-slavery doings. It entertained us not a little to scrutinise the sources whence the cheering appeared to proceed, during the rev. gentleman's address. It was evident, from a glance, that the applause, such as it was, reached Mr Macnaughtan as the enemy of Popery, and the friend of the Sabbath, and not at all as the advocate of a pro-slavery church. In more quarters than one, it amused us to observe the extent to which his speech on Maynooth, and his sermon on the Sabbath, appeared to have gained for the speaker a *carte blanche*, to say what he chose, and yet be sure of a cheer. Deep conversations absorbed not a few of his admirers during the utterance of a paragraph, which were only interrupted when the silence gave warning that it was necessary to applaud; and, in sooth, it was not an inexcusable, but, on the contrary, almost a natural conclusion to draw, that so violent an enemy to the Catholics, and so firm a friend of the Sabbath, could say nothing but what was right on the subject in hand. Had we reason to fear that this harangue, tolerated only on the strength of certain past services, had made any way towards deluding the audience, we might have thought it worth while to enter on some rejoinder. As it is, however, we are convinced that no other end would be secured by the attempt, than the gratification of the orator himself, who would smile at the simplicity of our hearts, in supposing that any

one required it. The majority of Mr Macnaughtan's arguments we had heard twenty times before, and the remainder we desire never to hear again. Shrewd enough to know that a Christian audience would have spurned with indignation his own favourite apology for slavery on New Testament grounds, the speaker relied mainly on the argument, that remonstrance had not yet had its perfect work; and promised, on behalf of his friends, that when the warnings of the Free amounted numerically to those of the Secession Church, the required severance of connexion should take place. But what matters it, every one must ask, from what source remonstrances reach the slave-owners in America? Are not the warnings of the Secession, and of other bodies, equally valid and likely to tell, with those of this new denomination? And if a sheep-stealer, discarded from the Church in Glasgow, and expelled from the Church in Edinburgh, were to offer himself to the Church in Paisley, would Mr Macnaughtan welcome him to fellowship, until his own remonstrances had been fully tried on his behalf? The fact is, that nothing in the annals of reasoning was ever more fallacious than this argument on the score of forbearance. The entire fabric of smooth and maudlin declamation to which we listened on this head, rested on the postulate never to be granted, that the refusal to fraternize destroys all future possibility of remonstrance—whereas the *Scripture* rule on this head is:—"If any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and *have no company with him*, that he may be ashamed—yet count him not as an enemy, but *admonish* him as a brother." The admonition may come, at least as appropriately, *after* the withdrawal, as it came before. On this course it was that the Secession Church lately resolved—and not on that, as Mr Macnaughtan erroneously asserted, of abandoning the work of expostulation as henceforth inadmissible. We were sorry to see the miserable expedient to which the orator was reduced in a subsequent part of his address. Having excited the unequivocal indignation of the audience, by declaring that under certain circumstances a man might lawfully "become a *slave-holder*," it will not soon be forgotten, that he instantly qualified the statement thus—"In such a case I would purchase the woman, *but she should not become my slave*." We cheered this latter sentence, in common with the rest of the audience, but it was with us, as with them, not in approbation of the speaker's adroitness, but in derision at his guile. We shall take an early opportunity of referring to one other clap-trap, by which the ignorant might possibly have been deceived—we mean the garbled quotation from Wilberforce, on

the authority of the Bishop of Oxford. We can prove, in a trice, that from that quarter at all events, Mr Macnaughtan gains far less than he loses. For the present, we take leave to remind him in parting, that whatever may have been his previous success, when he had a better cause to plead, the men of Newcastle are not to be caught in snares so ill-constructed as those laid for them on Tuesday night. The rev. gentleman will not be long in discovering that there is even more pains-taking required for the conversion of a town to pro-slavery heresy, than in lording it over a corporation, in the matter of a *church-bell*.

To Mr Wallace Duncan, we have even less to say, in taking leave. Our original opinion of his letter remains as it was—whilst our judgment of its author has grown less favourable in consequence of his explanation. We still hold, that "abuse, ill-bred and personal," may as effectually be conveyed by the asking of a question, as by the affirmation of a statement; and if it were our wish to insult Mr Duncan, which we assure him will never be the case, it would be altogether immaterial to us, whether we said "*Who are you?*" if we had a design on his dignity; or whether we more honestly declared him a a mean and insignificant individual. In like manner, if we were to meditate an attack on his truthfulness, we could do it quite as well by saying, "was any one weak enough to take your word?" as by openly charging him with the utterance of a lie.

THE FREE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

To the Editors of the Newcastle Guardian.

GENTLEMEN,—It affords me great satisfaction to find that, in your respectable and talented journal, you have taken a decided position in favour of the oppressed negro, connected with the present much-agitated question of American Slavery. I rejoice that this, as one of the great public questions of the age, is awakening a more eager attention in the public mind. While the feverish excitement of any angry passion is ever to be avoided and deplored, it is confessedly right that, in the course of every discussion, there should be, combined with proper calmness, an intensity of feeling proportioned to the magnitude of the point at issue.

My chief purpose, however, in now requesting the favour of a little space in your columns, is to correct some erroneous impressions produced by certain proceedings in the Music Hall, when a public meeting was held on the 7th instant, on behalf of the Free Church of Scotland. The chief speaker, on that occasion, was the Rev. Mr McNaughtan. It is not my intention, at this time, to review the rev. gentleman's entire speech; but, I may just say, in one sentence, that, with many excellent things it contained, as to the position of the Free Church of Scotland, connected with the cause of our common christianity; as to that part of it which referred to American slavery, it has seldom or never been my lot to listen to a speech more deplorably deficient in point of sound logical and scriptural argument, or more abundantly characterized by its opposites,—its special pleadings,—its contradictions,—and its sophistries. What, for instance, could be more glaring than that, after frankly and freely admitting that "American slavery is one of the greatest evils found existing on

the face of God's earth,"—a saying to which I feelingly respond,—he should be found asserting the propriety of christian fellowship with American churches, amongst whom this enormous evil is cherished, and declaring that the Free Church of Scotland, in maintaining their friendly position as to those American churches, "*is not wrong?*" He avowed that he did not belong to an *infallible church*, but to one which God had very signally blessed in a variety of ways,—then added, "when God has so signally blessed the Free Church, *is it to be supposed that He has abandoned her to blindness as to her position in relation to American churches?*" What species of argument is this? A reference to one or two scriptural facts will help us to judge of it. When God blessed the first father of our race with so many good things in the garden of Eden, but told him, as to one tree, that he was not to touch it, *is it to be supposed that the same God abandoned him to blindness*, as to that one forbidden tree, of whose fruit he was induced to take and eat? Is it to be supposed that God, who had blessed Noah, when having saved him and his family from destruction by the flood, *abandoned him to blindness* as to the use of the vine, when that patriarch took and tasted too freely of the juice of the grape? The absurdity, to say nothing more severe, of the principle assumed in this part of the rev. gentleman's statement, is such, I imagine, as will evince itself, on a little reflection, to the simplest minds. But, on this point, I at present forbear, without going into further statements or details.

The only other thing to which I will now, gentlemen, with your leave, a little more particularly advert, is a circumstance which occurred at the public meeting on the 7th instant, in which reference was made to the United Secession Church, with which I am connected. Speaking of that church, Mr McNaughtan described it as having taken a proper position, and set a good example to others by declining to hold christian fellowship with American churches giving countenance to slavery. "But on what ground," the rev. gentlemen asked, "had the Synod of the United Secession Church adopted this course?" *It was after previous remonstrance without the desired effect.*" Thus far Mr McNaughtan's statement, upon this specific point, was in harmony with the facts of the case. The Synod of the Secession Church, when meeting in May, unanimously adopted the following resolution, viz., "That the Synod, regarding the system of slavery as a heinous sin, and *that* of America as a sin of a peculiarly heinous and aggravated character,—and having, with these convictions, on former occasions, addressed the Presbyterian Churches of America in the language of faithful and earnest remonstrance, but hitherto without the desired effect,—now feel it their imperative and solemn duty to express their unwillingness to hold christian fellowship with any church which sactions that system of iniquity; and appoint a committee to prepare a memorial, embodying these sentiments, to be addressed to the Presbyterian and other churches in America giving their sanction to slavery,—in that memorial, remonstrating against this unholy thing, and entreating them to put it entirely away." Now, I presume, that Mr McNaughtan might see that resolution in the newspapers or some other periodicals, and how, with such facts before him, he could reiterate the saying, as he did, at the public meeting here, that, on resolving to decline christian fellowship with the slave-holding or slave-sanctioning churches of America, the Secession Synod had determined to have nothing more to do with those churches *by correspondence, entreaty, or remonstrance*, I shall leave himself, if he chooses, to explain, and others to form their own conjectures or conclusions. The simple fact is this. The Secession Synod, at a recent meeting, after previous ineffectual remonstrance, determined to decline christian fellowship with the American churches that lend their sanction to slavery. This resolution was prompted by the inspired precept, "*withdraw from the brother that walketh disorderly.*" It was determined, at the same time, not to desist from other measures, but to employ the most proper and prac-

I trust that a public meeting will be held, ere long, in Newcastle, to consider the question of American slavery, when ample scope will be given to its discussion.

In the meantime, I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

JAMES PRINGLE.

Clavering Place, July 9th, 1846.

The Witness.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 8.

THE *DAILY NEWS* AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The *Daily News* of Monday the 29th ult. contains an article on the agitation at present prevailing in Scotland on the relation of the Free Church to the Churches in the slaveholding States of America. The writer, after stating the causes out of which this agitation has arisen, and the length to which it has been carried, tenders, in conclusion, his advice to the Free Church, to send back the money. Writing at a distance from the scene of the controversy, and evidently but imperfectly acquainted with its merits, it is not surprising that he should employ language on some points which is calculated to convey to the public in England an exaggerated impression of the state of matters in Scotland as regards this question. "The atmosphere of Scotland," he says, "is full of one universal roar, 'Give back the money.'" We have had noise enough, certainly, but not by any means to the extent these words would intimate. Certain classes have raised an outcry in some of our great cities; but to say that this outcry pervades the entire "atmosphere of Scotland" is to use a figure of speech, and nothing more. This is a part of the question, however, which every man will determine according to his own feelings and prejudices;—there is no authorised standard by which we can try it. Not so the advice which the writer tenders. There is a fixed and very authoritative rule to which it must be subjected. The party to whom the advice is given is a Church: a Church is bound to regulate her procedure, not according to any amount of clamour that may be raised either for or against her, but according to the laws of her Head, contained in Scripture. Is it on these principles that the advice here tendered is framed? It does not even profess to be so. The writer has not a glimpse of the real question at issue. He does not once appeal to the principles by which that question is to be determined. The whole logic of the article is, "The atmosphere of Scotland is full of one universal roar, 'GIVE BACK THE MONEY,' *ergo*, 'GIVE BACK THE MONEY.'" The fatal objection to this kind of logic is, that Scripture, and not clamour, is the rule of the Church's procedure.

We are prepared to show, *first*, that the way in which the controversy has been conducted is such as to force the conviction irresistibly on the minds of all reasonable men, that the real end of those who began this agitation is something very different indeed from the end they profess to have in view, namely, the eman-

cipation of the slave. *Secondly*, that the course which the Free Church is called on to adopt, and that under the penalty of utter extinction, provided the power of the parties who have chosen in this case to lay down the law with its awards shall serve them, is a course which other religious bodies in Britain who are situated substantially, as regards this matter, precisely as the Free Church is situated, are not called on to adopt; and we are utterly at a loss to discover the principle on which it is held a sin of the deepest dye on the part of the Free Church of Scotland to act in a way in which other bodies are acting who are not held chargeable in the matter with any sin at all. And, *thirdly*, that the rule by which the Free Church, and every Church, must regulate her procedure in this and in all matters is the law of the Bible; and we think that the position she has taken up,—that of remonstrance first,—is in accordance with this law, and therefore impregnable.

Well, then, what is the end which the authors of this agitation profess to have in view, and how far do their actings, when fairly interpreted, bear out in this respect their professions? Their professed object is the abolition of American slavery,—a most righteous and noble end. Had the parties in question the virtue sincerely to entertain this end, and the power successfully to accomplish it, humanity would owe them much. Nor is there any land on earth that would lie under greater obligations to them than America herself. Oh, from what guilt now, from what judgments in time to come, would not the utter extinction of the accursed system of slavery save her! But it is just because we are deeply impressed with the godlike character of the enterprise, and desire above all things to see it prosper, that we are so careful to test the professions of those who say they are friendly to this great object. We would be allowed in any matter to look at the means employed, and to enquire how far they were fitted to gain their end; and surely, where so much is at stake, it cannot be held unlawful or presumptuous to enquire how far the means which have been had recourse to in this instance are fitted in reason to promote the abolition of slavery, or whether their plain and palpable tendency be not to promote a very different issue, and one which would indefinitely postpone a day which would be a most blessed one to America, and to all the earth. There is a natural logic betwixt the ends and the actions of a man. The latter necessarily take their shape and colour from the former, and the one are the truest exponents of the other. In the hour of excitement, which comes to communities as well as to individuals, that test may not be applied. But that hour soon passes away; reason and reflection return; and the parties whose vehemence or violence may have carried all before it formerly, are then tried by the test of their measures, and receive credit for sincerity just to that amount, and no farther, to which their actions, fairly inter-

preted, appear to entitle them. Let the parties in question be assured, that by this test they shall infallibly, in the long run, be tried; and that they must stand or fall as the friends of abolition, according as they abide the test. In anticipation of this more general trial, we ourselves shall take the liberty now of applying this testing rule.

The abolition of American slavery, and the co-operation of the Free Church, is the avowed object of those who commenced and who are struggling to keep up this agitation. They have considered, they tell us, the position this Church holds in Christendom,—the authority and influence her name carries with it in every part of the earth, and they are persuaded that they can have no more effective ally in this warfare than that Church. Then the question is, what is the course of conduct which a body of men, sincerely entertaining this end, and intent singly on its success, would naturally, necessarily, and inevitably adopt? We must grant them a fair share of temper, and discretion, and knowledge of human nature, and skill in the conduct of public business. Would not their approach to a Church whose alliance they profess to court, and whose character they profess to esteem, be at least respectful? Everything tending unnecessarily to irritate, or to engender distrust, or to create bars in the way of co-operation, would be carefully avoided. If aware that the party to whom they were making approaches held sentiments in some points not altogether in unity with theirs, would they not seek an interview in private with the leaders of that other party?—would they not endeavour, by the calm statement of their opinions, by reasonable explanation and fair argument, to effect a harmony of sentiment between themselves and those whose aid they solicit? Supposing that they were but slenderly endowed with the qualities of temper, and discretion, and knowledge of human nature, yet their wish to succeed in their attempt, supposing it was sincerely made, would, as by a kind of instinct, lead them to such a line of conduct. It would not be till they had exhausted representation and remonstrance in private, and not till the eleventh hour, that they would draw off, and assume the attitude of open war.

But instead of this, the parties in question have acted as if they dreaded above all things that their attempt should succeed,—that they should obtain the co-operation of the Free Church, and that that Church should listen to their advice, and "Send back the money." Without affording an hour's space for explanation or deliberation, they dragged her before the tribunal of the public, and endeavoured to make judgment go against her, by applying to her the vilest epithets, and loading her with the coarsest abuse. Their quiver was full of arrows; but against whom were their arrows shot! Not against the American slaveholder, but against the

men whom Scotland holds, above all others, in most affectionate reverence and honour,—the men who have filled the world, by their writings and labours, with the renown of their piety and philanthropy. The lowest buffoonery, the most ribald jests, the most impudent perversions of language, the vilest innendoes and insinuations,—all were pressed into the service, to damage the character and destroy the influence of the most venerable of living Scotchmen, and to hold them up in an assembly of their countrymen, as deserving of more contempt and reprobation than the American slaveholder himself. Meanwhile the poor slave was forgotten. Though lavish to excess of their eloquence on other matters, in pleading his cause they were indeed poor in words. Alas! they could put forth but feeble efforts to enlist the sympathy and pity of their hearers for the miseries of the slave, or to fan the flame of their indignation at the recollection of his wrongs. Their great strength was expended on other themes, which appeared much more congenial. We do not hesitate to affirm, that these men have betrayed the cause of the slave in Scotland.

Such have been the weapons employed,—such the spirit in which the contest has been carried on. When before did it happen that so sacred a cause was managed in this manner,—that the emancipation of the slave was sought in the way of inflicting the most unmeasured abuse, and holding up to the most unmeasured scorn, not the men who had enslaved him, but the men who were most disposed to rescue him from slavery? Yes, it did once happen before. This game was played in another land, and with more fatal effects, alas! to the slave, than have yet followed it in Britain. Why has the Abolition cause made so slow progress in America? Why is the hour so distant when the knell of that accursed system shall be sounded in that land? Why is it that at this day there are not fewer than three millions of human beings on the other side of the Atlantic, on whose limbs the chain still hangs, and, of course, not indeed an equal number of men, but still a very considerable number, in whose hands is still found the infernal slave-whip? One answer uniformly is given to these questions by those best acquainted with the state of matters in that country, and that answer is, that the slow progress of the abolition cause these twenty years past, is mainly attributable to the violence of the ultra-Abolitionists. On no point is there such an agreement of testimony among religious men in America as on this. The cause of abolition was proceeding quietly, yet surely; it was making new converts every year, and its friends were looking forward to its complete success at no distant day, when its progress was arrested by the extravagance of the ultra-Abolitionists. We could point to a leading journal in New York, enjoying a large circulation among the Slave States of the south, which was doing much to diffuse sound views on the subject of slavery, by the

insertion of articles favourable to the great cause of emancipation. Well, the ultra-Abolitionists arose; and the journal in question was denounced as a pro-slavery journal, and its editor as an advocate of slavery. Some thirty years ago, numerous Abolition Societies were formed in several of the southern States,—in Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. But let the reader mark,—the *disappearance* of these societies was cotemporaneous with the *rise* of the ultra-Abolitionists. Previous to the rise of this class, it had been far from being a thing of rare occurrence to hear members of the Legislatures of the Slaves States expressing sentiments favourable to the emancipation of the slave; but by and by came the reckless charges, and the fierce invectives and denunciations, of the ultra-Abolitionists; and what was the immediate consequence? Why, not a word was now to be heard favourable to the cause of abolition in any Legislature of the south. The plan of the colony of Liberia was brought to nought by the same influence. These are the services for which the slave has to thank this class of Abolitionists. Similar services they have striven most anxiously to render for him in Britain. When the groans of the slave ascend to heaven against the slave-owner, do not his groans also ascend against the men whose violence has postponed indefinitely the day when his fetters shall be loosed?

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WITNESS.

Mr Editor,—Will you permit an American, who is casually sojourning in Scotland, to say a word on the subject connected with his own country, which is exciting so much discussion here at this moment; I mean American slavery? If the good people of Scotland are to act in reference to this great evil, it is certainly desirable that they should understand its history; and especially,

1. They ought to know that the curse of slavery was inflicted upon the American States by Britain, while they were her colonies, in opposition to the repeated and earnest remonstrances of the colonists.

2. They ought to know that the great anti-slavery movement, which is now going over the world, originated in America; and that Britain, in her negociations for the abolition of the slave trade, and in her laws for the abolition of slavery, merely followed the example of the Northern States of the American Union.

3. They ought to know that impartial justice, in awarding honours for praiseworthy anti-slavery action to the different branches of the Anglo-Saxon family, must bestow the laurel, not on Britain, not on the Northern States of America, but on a noble band in those very slaveholding States of Maryland and Virginia, on which ultra-Abolitionists in Britain and America are accustomed to heap unmeasured and undiscriminating abuse.

4. They ought to know that slavery was so deeply rooted in the Southern States of America, while they were under the dominion of Britain, that the rapid eradication of it by merely moral means would be the greatest moral miracle that the world ever witnessed.

If these assertions are true, I think you will say, Mr Editor, that it is important, at this time, to show that they are true; and although I have not access here to the documents which would enable me to go as minutely into the matter as I could wish, I will, with your leave, amplify a little under each of these heads.

1. That the slaves were introduced into the present American States by Britain, while they were her colonies, is generally known to readers of history. It is not so generally known that this was done in opposition to the remonstrances of the colonists. The evidence of this fact, however, has often been published in America; and it is well known there that, in the first draft of the declaration of American Independence, Mr Jefferson introduced the refusal of Britain to heed those remonstrances as one of the justifications of that declaration. The wise men of Virginia, and other slave-holding States, at an early period foresaw the ruin with which slavery threatened their beautiful country, and sought to avert it by petitioning the British Parliament to stop the importation of slaves; but Parliament was then deaf to the voice of humanity; and Africa was robbed of her sons, and America doomed to suffer for ages under the most grievous of all curses, that British slave-traders might live in palaces, and revel in luxuries, bought with the price of human blood, and the devastation of two continents.

When the first slaves were landed in Massachusetts, more than two hundred years ago, the people of that colony were so indignant, that they fitted out a vessel, put the slaves on board, sent them back to Africa, landed them on the coast, near the spot from which they had been taken, and passed a bill in the Colonial Legislature, making man-stealing felony without benefit of clergy. But, unhappily, Massachusetts was then a colony, and this act, and all her anti-slavery acts, were frustrated by the refusal of the mother country to ratify them. Massachusetts was compelled to suffer cargoes of slaves to be landed and sold on her shores; and at the period of her independence, seventy years ago, there were in her territory some thousands of these slaves, who were then, when she formed her own constitution, instantly emancipated.

2. It must be a consolation to all who sincerely desire the abolition of slavery in America, to know that the hatred of slavery there is more ancient, more deeply-rooted, and bore earlier and better fruit, than in Britain; and that when the fanaticism of the American ultra-Abolitionists (which places the great body of the people of that country in a false position before

the world, and has given slavery recently some lamentable triumphs), shall pass away, we may confidently expect to witness in America achievements of anti-slavery principle more glorious than any that the world has yet witnessed.

We have already stated that the people of Massachusetts, 200 years ago, sent back the slaves to Africa; that they made repeated attempts, while subject to Britain, to put a stop to the slave-trade; and that, when they became independent, they abolished slavery, not gradually, but instantly. The abolition of slavery in Massachusetts was not by statute law, but by declaration in public convention, that all men are born free and equal; a declaration which her Courts have always regarded as equivalent to the assertion that no statute was needed to abolish slavery on her soil; that slavery had always been forced upon her by Britain; and that when the dominion of Britain ceased, slavery ceased.*

The other Northern States of America did not take as high ground as Massachusetts; but laws for the abolition of slavery had been passed in all these

---

* Massachusetts, which thus gloriously led the way in the anti-slavery war, is also distinguished for having taken the lead in many other great and good enterprises. The *first Protestant mission to the heathen* was that of the Plymouth colonists, who planted this State in 1620, and assigned as their principal reason for going to America, "that they might preach the gospel of Jesus Christ to the poor heathen in that land." The first *translation of the Bible* by an Anglo-Saxon into a heathen tongue, was the translation, by the celebrated John Eliot, into the language of the Massachusetts Indians. The people of Massachusetts were the first to adopt and fully carry out the principle that *every child in the land must be educated*. Their present admirable school system dates from the first settlement of the colony, more than 200 years ago. The great *temperance reformation*, which is now extending over Europe, originated in Massachusetts, and is more thorough there than in any other country. This little State, with only one-fourth of the territory, and a little more than one-fourth of the population, of Scotland, has more ships, more seamen, more extensive fisheries, more miles of substantial railroad, connecting the capital, in the most perfect manner, with every part of the territory, fewer drunkards, fewer paupers, a more abundant and equally-distributed supply of the substantial comforts and conveniences of life, more flourishing common schools, high schools, and colleges,—more, in short, of all the elements of national wealth and respectability in the bud, than any district of equal population on the globe. The people of this State are entirely unanimous in a deep abhorrence of slavery. They hate it with a perfect hatred. They regard it as the great enemy of their country. They are ready to enlist with their whole heart and soul in any rational war against it; but they will not engage in a crusade, on the principles, in the spirit, or under the lead, of the ultra Abolitionists. They hate slavery, but they love their Christian brethren in the slaveholding States, and have great confidence in their patriotism and piety. In the seven years' war for her own liberty, Massachusetts fought side by side with her sister States of the south, under George Washington of Virginia, who was nominated to the command by John Adams, her own leading patriot; and in the great moral war with slavery, she would choose, on every account, to put southern men in command; she would hope again to find some noble Virginian, who would be able to exhibit, among other qualifications for the office of Commander-in-Chief of the anti-slavery host, that best of all proofs of true zeal and devotedness in the good cause, a willingness, like Washington, to emancipate his own slaves.

States, which embrace more than two-thirds of the white population of the American Union, long before the question of abolition of slavery in the West Indies was agitated in Britain.

In 1788, when the present Constitution of the United States was formed, all the great maritime powers of Europe, including Great Britain, were actively engaged in the African slave-trade, and scarcely a murmur was heard against that infamous traffic, even among good Christians in England and Scotland. And yet, at that time, of the thirteen sovereign and independent States in America, *eleven* were ready to vote for its immediate abolition, and only two, South Carolina and Georgia, withheld their consent. These two were finally prevailed upon by the rest to permit an article to be inserted in the new Constitution, conferring upon Congress the power to abolish the trade after a period of twenty years. This negociation with South Carolina and Georgia was the first negociation for the abolition of the African slave-trade. The negociations of Great Britain with Spain, Portugal, and France, were not commenced until long afterwards.

3. The most praiseworthy manifestations of anti-slavery principle, and the greatest sacrifices in the anti-slavery cause, yet made in any part of the Anglo-Saxon world, have been made in the slave-holding States of America.

The abolition of slavery in the British West Indies was a noble deed, but the principal sacrifice in that case was the sacrifice of the West India proprietors, who made it reluctantly, and only in obedience to the vote of a Parliament in which they were not represented. The abolition of slavery in the Northern States of America has the merit, that it was effected at a time when Britain and the whole European world were unblushing supporters of slavery and the slave-trade; and in Massachusetts, the act had the crowning grace that it was done instantly, and in the indignant manner that became a religious and high-minded people in dealing with such a question. But in all the American States which have abolished slavery, the slaveholders, although represented in the legislatures and conventions, were so few in number, that opposition, if they had made it, would have been of no avail, and negro emancipation, therefore, wears there the ungracious aspect of a sacrifice forced from the slave-holder by the vote of men who themselves suffered no loss. It is only in the slave-holding States of America, where no law requires emancipation, that the noble deed was the free-will offering of men who themselves bore the whole burden and cost of the sacrifice. In those States there were, in 1840, 215,580 free blacks, whose value as slaves, at L.100* each, would be L.21,558,000,—a sum greater than that paid by the people of Britain for emancipation in the West Indies. This is the sacrifice on the altar of anti-slavery principle made in the slave-holding States of America, not by men who were compelled to do it by vote of a Parliament in which they were not represented,—not by

men who could put their hands into the richest treasury in the world, and pay out such a sum without feeling it,—but by volunteers, most of whom by their noble act reduced themselves and their families from affluence to poverty.

Of the 215,000 emancipated blacks, 62,000 are in Maryland, a little State, with a white population scarcely greater than that of your city of Glasgow. What do you think, Mr Editor, of a few thousand individuals in so small a community, making a voluntary sacrifice of property to the amount of more than L.6,000,000, out of regard to anti-slavery principle? Is there any parallel to it in the history of emancipation in the British empire? Is there any parallel to it in the history of the world? This sacrifice, let it be remembered, was a sacrifice of property and power inherited from ancestors who acquired and held it under all the sanctions of British law. If it could be demonstrated that the surrender by the British aristocracy of the property and power which they hold uuder the same law would greatly benefit their country and mankind, how many of them, think you, would imitate the example of the aristocracy of Maryland, and, solely from regard to patriotism and principle, make themselves and their children poor and powerless?

Would you not expect, Mr Editor, that facts so encouraging to all who sincerely desire the abolition of slavery in America, as those I have stated in this article, would be often repeated, and dwelt upon with delight by the speakers at your anti-slavery meetings, and the writers in your anti-slavery publications? I have attended, Sir, many of these meetings since I arrived in Britain, and have read many of these publications, but I have not heard an allusion to one of them. All that I have read and heard is calculated to leave the impression, that anti-slavery principle and anti-slavery feeling in America are confined to a little band of choice spirits in the non-slaveholding States, whom they call, and who call themselves, the Abolitionists; but with whom, permit me to say, the real Abolitionists of America, by which term I mean here the body of noble-minded men in Maryland† and other States, who have actually emancipated their slaves, have no fellowship and no sympathy.

4. Few persons have any adequate conception of the firmness with which slavery was rooted in the Southern States of America while they were under British dominion. If the importation of slaves had been stopped when the wise men of the South first remonstrated against it, slavery might long ere this have been abolished there by vote of the Legislatures, as it was in the north; but the importation was driven on until the slaveholding interest overwhelmed and controlled all others. More than half of the population in all the low country of those States are now negro slaves; while all political power is in the hands of the other half, the great majority of whom are slaveholders and their dependents. Each of these

States has the exclusive control of slavery within its own limits. Neither the Government of the United States, nor the Government of any of the Northern States, can meddle with the matter in any way. If slavery is abolished in any State, it must be by the vote of the Legislature of that State,—a Legislature, the majority of whose members are ordinarily themselves actual slaveholders; it must be by the vote of a body of wealthy and powerful men, who will by that vote deprive themselves of the wealth and the power which they inherit from their ancestors. This is an entirely new case. It is not the case of slavery in the West Indies,—it is not the case of slavery in the Northern States of America. Slavery was abolished in those countries by Legislatures in which there were few if any slaveholders. That was an easy task. We have now to solve a far more difficult problem. How shall we contrive to abolish slavery in a country where nothing effectual can be done without the consent and active co-operation of the actual slaveholder? Shall we begin with denouncing him? Shall we refuse to have any fellowship with him? Shall we shut him out of our prayer-meetings and temperance-meetings? If he is disposed to sympathise with us, and offers us money to help us in our necessities, shall we throw it in his face? And, to make him feel how reasonable it is that we, of all people in the world, should treat him so, shall we tell him that we are Britons,—that we belong to the country which forced this slavery upon him,—that we live in houses built with the money which he paid us for these slaves, and that we mean still to live in them, while we call upon him to give up the property we sold him, as he can have no good title, because we stole it? Is this the way that British Christians are to deal with American slaveholders?

No; the abusive, denunciatory, non-intercourse policy will not do. The ultra-Abolitionists in the Northern States of America have tried it for more than ten years, and the result has been just what all men of plain common sense predicted. All the while that this abolition storm has been blowing from the north, the southern slaveholder has stood with his cloak wrapped closely about him, and we do not expect to see him throw it off till the storm subsides, and the sun of Christian love again shines warmly upon him. Every high-spirited people instinctively resist foreign interference in their affairs. If that interference comes in the shape of moral rebuke, they will naturally look sharply at the party who administers it; and if they see there, as they would see in the present case, one whom they deem more guilty than themselves,—one who led them into their sin, and who has profited by their sin,—the thief, in short, who sold them the stolen goods which he now calls upon them to restore,—they will not tolerate in such a reprover, the arrogant language of the Pharisee, "Stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou," but will require him to approach in the attitude of the humble penitent,

confessing and grieving for the wrong he has done and offering to do all in his power to repair it. * If Britons would aid in abolishing American slavery, let them go in that attitude, and with the language and tone that become that attitude ; and the force of their rebuke, in the bosom of every truly Christian slaveholder, would be irresistible. S. E. M.

---

* It was recently stated by an American Abolitionist at an anti-slavery meeting in London, that the value of American slaves varied from L.160 to L.200. We think it safe to say L.100.

† A few weeks since I attended the great anti-slavery meeting at Finsbury Chapel in London, called by Mr George Thompson, for the avowed purpose of bringing public sentiment in England to bear upon the Free Church in Scotland, and compel it to send back the money contributed for its relief in the slaveholding States of America. Allusion was indeed often made by the speakers at this meeting to *Maryland*, but it was always in connection with something *discreditable* to the State (for it seems that, after searching the statute-books, the newspapers, and all the records of the State, from its first settlement down to the present time, some discreditable things have been discovered), and when the orator had held up these deformities to the public gaze, and commented upon them till the audience were sufficiently inflamed, and began to cry out "Shame! shame!" he took care to add, "and the American Minister at the Court of St James is from this State," that the reproach of Maryland might thus be extended to the whole of America. Now, it is true, Mr Editor, that Mr M'Lane, the American Minister at the Court of St James, is from Maryland ; and it is true, too, that he is one of the noble band of real Abolitionists in that State, who long since reduced himself to poverty by emancipating the slaves which he and his good lady inherited from ancestors, who held them under laws made by Britain, and forced upon Maryland while she was under British dominion! But it did not suit the purpose of those who got up this sort of anti-slavery meeting to let such a fact be known. The object of Mr Thompson and his associates was to show that the wicked Americans were so inveterately attached to slavery, that it would be wrong in their mother Britain to suffer them to relieve the distressed, build churches, support ministers, attend temperance conventions, Christian conventions, prayer-meetings, or any other means of grace, until they had repented of the sin of slavery!

At this meeting one of the speakers quoted the fine passage from Curran, containing the sentiment "that there can be no slavery in Britain,—that the fetters of the slave fall from him the moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain," &c., and the deafening shouts with which the passage was received, showed the proud feeling excited in the bosom of Britons by this great boast of their country. I could not but think, however, that at the very moment when the Court decided the case of Somerset the slave, upon which that boast is founded, Britain was forcing slavery upon all her colonies in the New World. And what are we to think of a mother, with a poisoned cup in her hand, boasting that she would not for the world touch it to her own lips, and yet forcing her children to drink it to the dregs! Is her boast anything but that of a murderer who has too much sense to commit suicide!

180

ILLUSTRATIONS OF "SEND BACK THE MONEY" VERACITY.—MESSRS H. C. WRIGHT & Co., *VERSUS* THE FREE CHURCH OF HAWICK.

In an American newspaper called *The Liberator*, published at Boston, and dated May 1st, 1846, there was printed a letter, bearing the signature of Robert Michie, a respectable currier in Hawick, and addressed to H. C. Wright, the celebrated apostle of "Peace," and a distinguished member of the "Send back the Money" fraternity. A copy of this newspaper accidentally found its way from Boston to Hawick, and as the letter, authenticated by the name of Robert Michie, contained a number of very aggravated charges against the minister, elders, and the general congregation of the Free Church in that town, it soon created a sensation, and was eagerly inquired after, and was as eagerly read. The following is the letter referred to :—

No. I.

Copy Letter ROBERT MICHIE to HENRY C. WRIGHT, 4th March 1846.

(Copied from Liberator Newspaper of 1st May 1846.)

Hawick, 4th March, 1846.

SIR,—I perceive that your lectures on American slavery, and the question you ask, "Is it right to hold Christian fellowship with slaveholders in order to get their money to build our churches and pay our ministers?" have excited the bitterest opposition of many of the leaders of the Free Church ; and I have little doubt that many in distant parts of the world will be astonished, after having heard so much about their "glorious marching up out of the land of Egypt (the Established Church), and out of the house of bondage," that they should give the right hand of fellowship to such men, and thereby throw the shield of their protection over them, to whitewash them from their foul enormities ; but they who live among the Nons (as the Frees are called), who know their practices in reference to their fellowship at home, will never dream of being astonished at their receiving into their fellowship those blood-stained monsters who traffic in the blood, and sinews, and souls of our fellow-countrymen. In support of this allow me to state two cases in proof of their brotherhood at home, and if they are so easily pleased with their own members here, surely they cannot be so very particular as to their dear brethern the slaveholders of America.

A—— W——, a man who had been in business for himself, but who had failed in consequence of drunkenness, and who has lived here for many years as a public nuisance, a drunken, swearing, ill-natured man, who appears to act on Ishmael's principle, of having his hand against every man, and who, in consequence, may often be seen in the streets, followed by a bevy of boys annoying him and calling him names, and he in return cursing and swearing, and outraging all decency by his obscene blasphemies and disgusting oaths. Well, this man was a member of the Established Church before the Disruption, and for his bad conduct was suspended from Church privileges by Mr Wallace, the then minister of the kirk; but as soon as the house of bondage was left by Mr Wallace and his followers, this man had a token of admission to the Lord's table forced upon him by the same man who had formerly excluded him, and, I believe, is still in full communion with the Free Church, although his open profanity and drunkenness must be well known to every Non in the place.

The other case is that of A—— R——, a man who, for many years, has been a confirmed and hopeless drunkard, but who, through the instrumentality of teetotalism, was lifted up out of the deep degradation into which he had sunk ; and, after having remained firm to his pledge for a long time, I thought to magnify the principles of total abstinence, as he was a good tradesman, by setting him

up in business for himself, so that he might show to the world by his success in trade, that no man need despair, however prostrated by this demon alcohol, if he will only stick like a burr to teetotalism. After this he joined the Free Church, and got on prosperously for a time. At last, influenced by the tippling habits of his minister, Mr Wallace, and the elders and church-members, he tasted the fire-water, and fell prostrate before the fiend. The teetotallers again rescued him from the drunkenness into which the Rev. Mr Wallace, and his elders, and church, had plunged him, surrounded him with teetotal influences, to shield him against the influence of a tippling church and ministry, and got him to sign the pledge; but he never could again withstand his craving appetite for drink, and the tippling influence of his minister and church; and after alternately joining the society, and breaking his pledge, and taking in all who had any business transactions with him, he shared the fate of all drunkards, and became a bankrupt. In a penitential mood he came to me one day, his "claes, and cash, and credit gane," and confessed his errors, and, for the fiftieth time, promised amendment, and would again join the teetotallers, as soon as he was better of a disease, the consequence of his conduct. In this condition, the very personification of impiety and wickedness, in answer to a question that I put to him, he said, that neither Mr Wallace, his (Free) minister, nor any elder of his church, had ever remonstrated with him about his notorious excesses. During the conversation, I told him I was hearing Mr M'Crae, the parish minister, preach on Sabbath last, for the first time; when this brutalized debauchee, this unreproved member of the Free Church, seemed perfectly horrified, and declared that he had sunk very low in his own estimation, but he was not so degraded yet as to go and hear a sermon at the parish church.

Now, Sir, you see with whom they hold fellowship at home; and I could mention many more similar cases; and if they will give the right hand of fellowship to drunkards, fornicators, and blasphemers here, why should they not, for the price of it, give the right hand of fellowship to fornicators, man-stealers, and murderers in America.—I remain, dear Sir, yours most sincerely,

(Signed) ROBERT MICHIE.

H. C. Wright.

The circulation of this letter in Hawick, soon attracted the attention of the different parties it concerned, and, as might have been expected, the individual whose name it bore was not the last to peruse it, or the worst to alarm. And being conscious of having committed a serious error, and feeling heartily ashamed of certain gross accusations which the letter contained, and for which he must either be responsible himself or prove that his name had been surreptitiously used for the purpose of giving currency to vile calumnies, he wrote as follows to the Rev. Mr Wallace:—

No. II.

ROBERT MICHIE TO REV. MR WALLACE.

Hawick, 3d June 1846.

REV. SIR,—I have got put into my hands this evening a newspaper published in Boston, United States, called the *Liberator*, in which is published a letter bearing my signature, and purporting to be written by me. Now, I think it due to you, as well as to myself, to state, that some parts of that letter never was written by me. I did write to Mr Wright, which I now regret having done, remarking on some matters in connection with the Free Church, but judge of my astonishment, when a person brought up the newspaper this afternoon, to see that I was made to accuse you, your elders, and members, of making a person break the total abstinence pledge by your tippling examples. I never thought this, I never said it, and the person who has so altered my letter, and taken such liberties with my name, has wronged me grievously.

I have written to Mr Wright, a copy of which letter I beg to enclose for your inspection, demanding my letter, and an explanation for altering it; and his explanation shall be given to you.

It is impossible to express the sorrow and regret I feel at having written at all to Mr Wright on the subject on which I did write. I am sorry to come to the conclusion, that he is not what I took him to be; and I am willing to make any acknowledgment that truth and honour will permit me to do. I solemnly deny the authorship of this calumny, or even having given currency to it; and I hope the sorrow and vexation that I have felt will make me wiser and more cautious in future.—I beg to subscribe myself, Rev. Sir, yours most respectfully,

(Signed) Robert Michie.

The following is the enclosure mentioned in the above, and may be here inserted for the sake of connection :—

No. III.

Robert Michie to H. C. Wright.

Hawick, 3d June 1846.

Sir,—I have this evening got put into my hands a copy of the *Liberator*, of the date of 1st May, and in it is a letter bearing my signature, but containing a number of things that I never wrote, and, amongst other things, the fall of A—— R——, attributed to the tippling example of Mr Wallace, his elders, and members. Now, Sir, I cannot understand how this statement has got into the letter bearing my signature, and I write to you, demanding an explanation, and requesting you to "send back the letter," in order to show what I really have written. Every word I wrote is truth to the best of my knowledge, after inquiring into all the circumstances of the case; but even although true, had I foreseen the consequences of my imprudence, I would have suffered martyrdom rather than have written it. I have the copy from which I wrote the letter; but as there are a few verbal alterations made in re-writing it, it will be more satisfactory to me to have the letter itself. I therefore beg again to urge upon you to "send back the letter," and also to explain who made the additions and alterations, and for what reason they were made. Hoping you will be expeditious and explicit. I remain, yours truly,

(Signed) Robert Michie.

To the above letter from Mr Michie, Mr Wallace sent the following answer, which affords a beautiful illustration of that conscious uprightness which can bear with unruffled calmness the foulest charges, and of that Christian forbearance which can meet reviling with love and forgiveness :—

No. IV.

Rev. Mr Wallace, to Robert Michie.

Hawick, 4th June 1846.

Dear Sir,—I have just been favoured with your letter, and take the earliest opportunity of assuring you that I am much less concerned for any supposed injury inflicted on myself, than that anything should have occurred to be the occasion of annoyance to you. I can easily perceive, that whatever you may have written to Mr Wright, in regard either to myself, or to the Church with which I am connected, while written on your part honestly and conscientiously, has been perverted and misapplied in a way, and for a purpose, which I needed not your explanation to convince me, neither you nor any Christian man could ever sanction or approve. And in so far as I am personally concerned, I am quite willing that the whole matter should be buried in the grave of an everlasting forgetfulness.

Believe me, &c.,

(Signed) J. A. Wallace.

By this time, however, the letter in the *Liberator* had been read by several members of the Deacons' Court. Finding that the character both of their minister and the church to which they belonged, had been seriously and most unfoundedly assailed, they resolved to demand from Mr Michie an explanation of

the charges to which his signature was attached, and accordingly Mr Nixon of Lynnwood, one of the deacons, wrote to him as follows :—

No. V.

Mr Nixon to Robert Michie.

Lynnwood, Hawick, June 5, 1846.

Sir,—I have seen a letter said to be copied from the *Boston Liberator* of 1st May last, dated Hawick, 4th March, addressed to H. C. Wright, and signed "Robert Michie." Amongst other charges in that letter against the Rev. Mr Wallace, the writer thereof is made to say, in reference to a person said to have been reclaimed from dissipation, but relapsed,—"At last, influenced by the tippling habits of his minister, Mr Wallace, and the elders and church members, he tasted the fire water, and fell prostrate before the fiend. The teetotallers again rescued him from the drunkenness into which the Rev. Mr Wallace and his elders and church had plunged him."

That "an enemy had done this" admits of no doubt, and in my opinion, a more sweeping, more unfounded, and a more daring charge has seldom or ever been made against a minister of the gospel and a whole congregation of from 800 to 1000 persons. But, however that may be, I understand it is supposed you are the author of that letter, which, for your own sake, I hope is not the fact, and shall be happy to find that you altogether disown it —I request an early reply, and I am, &c.,

(Signed) W. Nixon.

Before the above reached Mr Michie, the following had been sent off to Mr Nixon, and may be considered as Mr Michie's answer :—

No. VI.

Mr Michie to Mr Nixon.

Hawick, June 5, 1846.

Sir,—Will you bear with me, while I state a few things to you in connection with that letter having my signature, which has appeared in the *Liberator* newspaper.

The reason why I address myself to you is, because I have been informed this morning, that you have entered a prosecution against me, for defamation of character, of Mr Wallace, the elders, and members. I feel anxious also to address myself to you as representative of the deacons, elders, and members of the Free Church here ; and if you can exercise that charity towards me, which will induce you to look at all the circumstances of the case, I believe that, instead of prosecution, you will feel sorry that I should have put it into the power of any man to act towards me as he has done.

The first thing that I beg to state to you is, that I did write a letter to Mr Wright, an incorrect copy of which I have past me; and if anything that I could do would recall that action, I would cheerfully do it. I never felt so vexed and sorry for any action that ever I did, as for the writing of that letter ; and if anything can be done consistent with honesty to counteract it, I will willingly do it. The only excuse I can plead for writing it is, I thought Mr Wright was almost an angel of light,—and I thought he was ill-used and calumniated,—and in an excited state of mind I stated some things to him, which he requested in the shape of a letter, which I, without ever thinking of the consequences, promised ; and then he urged me by letter afterwards, till I in an evil hour wrote what he had requested and urged upon me. Now, Sir, this is all the excuse which I can make,—which, I suppose, is no excuse at all. I freely confess that I was in the wrong in writing him at all ; and I believe that it is the last letter, and the last action of such a nature, that ever I will be guilty of. Words cannot express the sorrow that I have felt already ; and if you can suggest anything as an atonement for my error, consistent with truth, I will do it.

The next thing that I beg to say is, that the letter which appeared in the *Liberator* newspaper, is a gross misrepresentation of my mind and sentiment, and a gross

perversion of what I did write. I never wrote, and I never dreamed of writing, that any person was made to break the total abstinence pledge by the "tippling example of Mr Wallace, his elders and members." That, and all similar expressions and sentiments in that letter, is a *gross forgery*. I never wrote it, and I never thought it. I believe I never would have written it, had a fixed bayonet been pointed at my bosom to compel me to do it.

If it was Mr Wright that altered my letter and inserted these statements, then he is not at all what I thought him to be, and I have been grossly deceived by him. If it was not him who altered it, then he will be able to say who did, as I wrote to him last night demanding an explanation, and to "send back the letter."

In conclusion, I have to state, that all Wednesday, and yesterday, I was almost incapable of thinking or writing, with sheer vexation; but in the midst of my perplexity, I thought it to be my duty to write to Mr Wallace, and deny all connection with the authorship of the statement about tippling example, and wrote to him accordingly, sending a copy of the letter that I sent to Mr Wright; and in the course of a very short time I received a note from Mr Wallace, written in such a charitable, Christian, and kindly manner, that I shed tears of gratitude when I perused it,—it affected my mind, as oil is said to do the troubled ocean; and as long as memory lasts, his kindness and Christian charity shall be cherished in my bosom.

Let this matter end how it will, I have come to the resolution,—and I hope, through the strength of God, I will be able to stand by it,—that I will always, in future, act on the principle of the eastern proverb, "begin nothing, of which thou hast not well considered the end."

Begging your pardon for the liberty I have thus taken, in addressing the effusions of an almost distracted mind to you, I remain, yours most respectfully,

(Signed) ROBERT MICHIE.

Some other letters, besides the above, were written by Mr Michie, addressed to Mr Nixon and another of the deacons, but being similar in substance to the one here given, it would be needless to lengthen this correspondence by their publication. The following is Mr Wright's answer to Mr Michie's letter of the 3d, and certainly it unfolds, to the Christians of this country at least, an entirely new method of preparing slander. It will repay a careful perusal, but the system of which it affords a glimpse, can only excite loathing and disgust, and must meet with universal reprobation :—

No. VII.

HENRY C. WRIGHT TO ROBERT MICHIE.

Glasgow, 6th June 1846.

DEAR ROBERT,—Your note is just come. I procured the *Liberator* to which you called my attention, read your letter, or what was *intended* as yours, and with grief and astonishment find that my own *running notes*, apart from your letter entirely, are by the printers inserted as a part of your letter. It is certain you never wrote the passages alluding to the *minister*, elders, and members of the church. You have just cause to complain of injustice and wrong; and though the wrong and injustice has been done to you without any intention of mine, I must bear the blame and the responsibility. You have been wronged through me, for I was the means of publishing the letter, as I supposed I had leave to do; but the printers had no leave to insert my comments and explanations as part of your letter.

But the thing is done, and you ought not to suffer, and shall not. Tell me what I can do to repair the wrong that I have been instrumental in doing to you, and if in my power it shall be done.—Yours,

(Signed) HENRY C. WRIGHT.

Robert Michie.

It is impossible to justify Mr Michie's conduct in this affair; but, after perusing the above letter, and seeing the unequalled baseness which could use for such a fiendish purpose, a communication half extort-

ed from its author, transmitted in seeming confidence, and without leave to publish it, and all this perpetrated by a professed minister of "peace," wearing for a time the fair semblance of "an angel of light,"—after seeing this, an impartial public will readily decide on whose back the heaviest load of obloquy should rest, and on whose brow the deepest brand should be affixed. It is much to be regretted that the full extent of the interpolation made by Mr Wright, or his worthy scape-goat, the Boston printer, cannot now be ascertained. In answer to the request of Mr Michie, the original unaltered letter was returned; but, ashamed of his own genuine production, or feeling pity for his "angel" friend, Mr Michie committed to the flames the earnestly-sought-back original. However, but for the purpose of showing the extent of Wright's "running notes," the original would now be of little use. After repeated interviews with several members of the Deacons' Court, and with Mr Kirk, their agent, Mr Michie saw the propriety of retracting almost every charge preferred against the Free Church of Hawick, in the document bearing his name in the *Boston Liberator*. The following letter, addressed to Mr Kirk, has been accepted as satisfactory by those most concerned in the matter, and will doubtless be viewed in the same light by a discerning and unbiassed public :—

No. VIII.

ROBERT MICHIE TO Mr KIRK, Writer, Hawick.

Hawick, 23d June, 1846.

SIR,—In reference to the letter having my signature, and published in the *Boston Liberator*, you will observe that there are three distinct charges made in it. The first is the charge about the tippling habits of Mr Wallace, his elders, and members, which charge, I have steadily maintained from the first, never was made by me; and you will perceive, by referring to Mr Wright's letter of the 6th June, that he takes all the blame of that part of it upon himself, thereby vindicating the truthfulness of my statement, when I at once and distinctly denied ever having written that sentence, or giving any countenance whatever for its being written. I not only deny having written it, but I also solemnly maintain, that I never, either in conversation or otherwise, gave any person the least grounds for writing it. I may, perhaps, be considered by many, both in sentiment and opinion, to be too strictly teetotal, and to carry my notions too far; yet I never could charge Mr Wallace with being a tippler, as I never either heard, or saw, or knew of him drinking a single drop of intoxicating liquor. And in reference to his elders, out of the twelve, there are nine of them act on the teetotal principle,—eight of them are pledged teetotallers, and four of them are Rechabites. The other three, so far as I know, are steady, sober, and exemplary men. The charge then referred to, which was inserted into my letter, never was written by me, neither had Mr Wright any authority to alter my letter, or to say what he did, from any conversation he had with me. He himself has taken the responsibility off my head, and he himself must bear the blame.

In reference to the second charge, about A. W. being cut off from the church membership, by Mr Wallace, while in connection with the Established Church, I made that statement in my letter to Mr Wright, and I did it in the firm belief that it was true. I relied with implicit confidence on the truth of the statement there made; but having been credibly informed that Mr Wallace denies having suspended A. W., and last night having had a personal interview with two of Mr Wallace's elders, who were well acquainted with all the circumstances of the case,—and these two men I have been on intimate terms with for many years, and have the fullest confidence in, I, yours most respectfully,

(Signed) ROBERT MICHIE.

A VOICE FROM THE WEST.

Send back the money. They shall send back the money.—
Douglass' Lectures.

A voice came o'er the western waves,
Sublimely deep and loud,—
The cry of full three million slaves,
"Gie back, gie back the goud."

And startled Scotia heard that cry,
By mountain, glen, and wood,
And echo'd back the stern reply,—
"Gie back, gie back the goud."

Thus, said the voice, "Shall altars rise,
Built with our flesh and blood;
Shall Moloch's fanes insult the skies?—
'Gie back, gie back the goud.'

"And shall the sacred title, FREE,
Be on that fane bestowed;
Can freedom league with Slavery?—
'Gie back, gie back the goud.'

"Or can a freeman's stalwart knee
Be to our tyrants bow'd;
Can their largess be charity?—
'Gie back, gie back the goud.'

"Shall murderers of our ebo[illegible]ace
Be hailed as Christians good;
Can bland defence their guilt efface?—
'Gie back, gie back the goud.'"

This solemn voice could not appal
A priesthood mean and proud;
They answered nearly one and all,
"We'll not pay back the goud."

But Scotia—whose generous breast
Yearned for the injured—vowed,
That every guilty, blood-stained priest
"Should yet disgorge the goud."

NOTE.—It is probable that very reverend and learned gentlemen may object to the phrase, "*Gie back the goud*," as being rather the lingo of a Scotchman than that of a negro; but I would remind them, that Sambo is a simple, unsophisticated, imitative creature, who very readily acquires the power of expressing his wants and wrongs in the every-day language of those around him; nd it is highly probable that, had he got a college education, he might have been enabled thereby to turn common sense—like an old garment—upside down, and outside in, as well as his betters. He might have also been able to prove, to the entire satisfaction of every man *learned in the Word*, that the term *servant, means a slave*; and that whoever catches a runaway slave, and returns the same to his "lawful master," is an humble and virtuous imitator of the "Apostle Paul!"

THE NEWCASTLE ADVERTISER
And Commercial Herald.

TUESDAY, July 14, 1846.

THE FREE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

On Tuesday evening, a meeting was held in the Music Hall, Newcastle, for the purpose of affording to the Rev. Messrs Macnaughtan and Duncan an opportunity of explaining the present position of the Free Church of Scotland, and especially with regard to its connexion with the slave-holding churches of America. At first the attendance was very small, but soon afterwards the Hall became well filled.

The Rev. W. Blackwood having taken the chair, the meeting was opened with singing and prayer; and after a few observations by the chairman, the Rev. Mr Duncan, of North Shields, explained the present position of the Presbyterian church in England.

The Rev. Mr Macnaughtan then rose and observed, that he came there that evening in deference to the wishes of their friends in this town, who requested to know what they were doing in the northern part of the island. The rev. gent. then briefly touched upon the events connected with the separation of the Free Church from the establishment; after which he said, it had gone abroad, that the Free Church was not acting in all points according to the judgment of christendom, and to the law and the word of God required. Now he would repeat, he was not there to ask them for their approval of what the Free Church had done, or what it intended to do—for to their own Master they alone must answer; but he thought it right to say, that though the Free Church might or might not be wrong in this matter or anything else, he did not belong altogether to an infallible church. (Applause.) But they must not mistake him when he disclaimed infallibility; for it was his firm opinion that the Free Church was not wrong in the position they had taken in connexion with the American churches. (Applause.) Now in order to get at the merits of the case, it would be necessary, first of all, to refer historically to the movement of the Free Church, in relation to the churches of America. The historical connexion was this:—At the time of the disruption, an invitation was sent to Scotland from America, requesting a deputation to visit their churches; and at that time these churches were recognized as churches of Christ, both by the Independents and Secession denominations, though it was admitted that certain errors were connected with them. That, then, was their position when they sent their deputation out to America to explain the affairs of the Free Church in Scotland. On the arrival of the deputation at New York, they found all the arrangements made for them to preach in the various churches of the United States; and the committee appointed for that purpose were composed of gentlemen in New York, completely opposed to the system of slavery. Accordingly the deputation went the breadth and length of the land, preaching and making collections in behalf of the building fund; and the entire sum collected amounted to 10,000*l.*, a portion of which, viz., 3000*l.* was collected in the southern states, where slavery existed. That money was received at the church doors, but who it was that put it into the plates he did not pretend to say. (Hear, hear.) He had, however, no hesitation in saying, that he believed that money was put in indiscriminately by the persons composing the congregations—some might hold slaves and some might not. It was just given as at an ordinary collection in this country. They set up no inquisition to watch them who put money into the plates, or adopt any method similar to stopping a man putting sixpence into the plate, because they knew him to be a drunkard or something else. (Applause.) The deputation merely preached to the people—they made no inquiries as to who subscribed—neither did they institute any plan to ascertain who gave it at the church door; nay, in fact, they did not receive the money at all, for it was sent after them across the Atlantic. And that being the fact, what was it that the Free Church had to listen to respecting that £3000? Why, granting, for the sake of argument, that every copper of that sum belonged to slave-owners or holders of slaves, would any man, who was in his senses, believe that for the sake of that sum the Free Church had taken up her present position? What, after they had in the course of three years collected one million sterling, had they still to listen with patience to men who imagined for a moment that it was the love of the miserable pittance of £3000 that made them unwilling to make the sacrifice of it by sending it back? Sacrifice,

indeed! why they had already laid down a million of money at the foot of the state (great applause); and yet, forsooth, a mote was still found in their eye, which their opponents attempted to pull out in the shape of a paltry sum of £3000, and insult them to their very face by telling them that their love of money had influenced them to take up their present position. (Applause.) But what did the church do when she received this donation from America? The church knew right well that the position they had taken would create some discussion, and it therefore did not allow a single hour to pass without making it fully known. In the General Assembly of 1844, the deputation returned from America and gave in their report of how they had been received and treated, and what they felt and believed with regard to the character of the ministers and the churches in America; and on that very night, though there was no pressure from without, it was declared by the General Assembly that it was of the utmost importance to make their brethren in America know that it was their duty to seek the entire abolition of slavery in their land, and, in accordance with that, a committee was appointed to send them information to that effect, and that information was remitted to them in September, 1844. That deliverance was drawn up by the General Assembly's commission, and he now held in his hand a copy of it, and he thought it only proper to read a sentence or two from it, for he had heard the Free Church loudly called the abettors of slavery in America. The rev. gentleman then read a portion of the "deliverance" which was condemnatory of the system of slavery in every land, but especially as it existed in America, and urged upon the churches there to seek its immediate abolition, as it was contrary to the rights of man as a creature, and the glory of God as the creator. That remonstrance (said Mr M.) would reach the General Assembly of America in May, 1845, at the very time when the General Assembly of the Free Church was also sitting. It had been asked, did the Free Church send out a deliverance in May, 1845? The man that puts such a question certainly could not be a presbyterian, for if he was he would have known that when they had sent their judgment to another church, and asked them to give a deliverance, common sense required that nothing more should be said until that church had an opportunity of answering the first communication. (Applause.) That judgment went out to America in 1844, and the Free Church felt themselves bound to enlighten their brethren on the great question of slavery, and with the full knowledge that they could not receive that judgment before 1845, they were bound to wait, whatever might be their feelings, until they obtained a reply. Subsequently an answer had been received by the Free Church, and that answer he held in his hand. (Applause.) He, however, was free to admit that he did not at all approve of it (hear, hear)—nor did the Free Church approve of it—but such as it was they received it. In that reply the General Assembly of the American churches admitted many things which might be turned to good account in after correspondence. They admitted, for instance, the evils of slavery, acknowledged it as a great sin, and deplored their social position was such as to render it impossible to abolish it. (Hear, hear.) After that (said Mr M.) he could not justify them, because he thought they were entirely in a false position as a church; but whether they were right or wrong they evidently were out and out voluntaries, inasmuch as the church did not interfere with the state, nor the state with the church; for they said that because slavery was connected with the civil institutions of the country, they could not meddle with it at all. That then was their statement and not his, and he considered it a very flimsy sort of an answer; and a pretext which was at once destroyed, by their recent conduct, to prevent war between America and England. They alleged they could not interfere with slavery, because interwoven with the state; yet when America was threatened with an invasion by British arms, the ministers in the various churches called upon the people from their pulpits to interfere with government to prevent the consequences of war. (Applause.) Now the Free Church might go back with that fact in their hands, and ask them why they could not do that to abolish slavery which they did to prevent war? He held it to be the duty of every church to instruct the state, but after all they could not compel that state to act. The church was destined to be the light of the earth, and to diffuse right scriptural principles regarding the social as well as the eternal condition and destiny of man; but the church in America occupied a false position when she positively tolerated slavery, because it was connected with the civil condition of the people. Already the General Assembly of the Free Church had addressed to the Ameri-

can churches a reply wherein they expressed no desire to bring the correspondence to a termination, because the Free Church Assembly conceived that by carrying it on an opening might be found to the American mind, and thus be enabled to remonstrate with them, and tell them frankly what they thought of slavery as existing in the United States. Now, it was his opinion, that wherever slavery existed there was sin; and parties holding slaves must likewise be presumed to be sinners, unless indeed it was shown that it was their fault. It had been asked what object had the Free Church in carrying on the correspondence with America? Why not cut off all connection with them, and at once refuse to have any thing to do with them unless they gave up slavery altogether? But the answer they gave was that they desired to continue that correspondence in order to bring the mind of the Christian community of America to bear upon the question, and ultimately to force them out of their false position. He could easily understand how any one might quote scripture, and say "do unto others as you would like to be done by;" but he would like to ask the audience to go down the page of history as far as the year 1834, when slavery in all its forms existed in the West India colonies, and then before passing sentence of excommunication tell them what was their connection with the slave holders there. Did they allow them to come into their churches? Did they refuse their collections in aid of their ministers? Nay, rather was it not true, that all the time previous to the emancipation of the slave, they admitted slave-holders into their churches, and also received their contributions? If that was the case, why was it that a different rule was adopted now towards he Free Church? For himself he hated the system of slavery with all his heart wherever it existed. He knew from education what the slavery was that existed in Greece and Rome. He also knew something of slavery in the West Indies, and other places, but that which existed in the United States of America was such that he thought it impossible for any man to exaggerate in describing so cursed a system. (Hear, hear, and applause). He was not to be understood then as being an apologist for American slavery. He hated it with his whole soul, and it was only because he thought it a right way to act towards them that he approved of the position taken by the Free Church, which was to send remonstrance after remonstrance, argument upon argument, and only to cease their exertions when all hope of doing good was entirely extinct. (Applause). The system of slavery, however, was such that in some cases a man was obliged to keep slaves by the civil law; and if a man held 20 slaves and choose to turn them off, they would instantly be seized and sold again. Mr Macnaughtan then supposed an instance of a slave-holder possessing a female slave, whom he had kindly treated, and who, through his instrumentality, had been converted to christianity. Her master, however, being embarrassed in circumstances, she was about to be sold at the public market to appease the claims of his creditors, when she implored him (Mr M.) to buy her. Now in such a case, though he abhorred slavery, yet he would sooner become a slave-holder by purchasing that woman, than to let her go again into other hands. He would indeed pay the price, but she never should become his slave. (Much applause). And he asked would not any of them become a slave-holder for the sake of that poor woman? (Loud cries from several parts of the room of "No, No," hissing, and other expressions of dissent). It certainly was a matter of opinion, but he for one would not hesitate to act so. Mr McNaughton then thanked them for their indulgence, and concluded with demanding for the Free Church the privilege and right of taking what she considers the best method of convincing their brethren in America of the necessity of entirely abolishing slavery. Applause),

The Rev. W. W. DUNCAN, of Peebles, shortly addressed the audience, expressing his entire concurrence in what had fallen from Mr Macnaughtan.

The thanks of the meeting were then given to the deputation, and the meeting broke up.

190

CITY ELECTION.

SIR CULLING EARDLEY SMITH will Address the ELECTORS THIS DAY (Saturday), at Two o'clock, in ROSE STREET CHURCH (Rev. Mr M'Gilchrist's), and in the HOPETOUN ROOMS on MONDAY, at Two o'clock.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE CITY OF EDINBURGH.

Edinburgh, July 9 1846.

GENTLEMEN,

I have received an unexpected invitation, signed by several highly respectable Electors, to become a Candidate for the Representation of your City. Immediately on my arrival here this evening. I was conducted to a Public Meeting, which I was informed consisted of persons of various Political and Ecclesiastical opinions, where I was requested to state my views on public subjects, and especially on those which relate to the Protestant interests of our country. A resolution was passed, expressing a wish that I should be your Representative; and I am advised by the Chairman and others, who took a conspicuous part on the occasion, that it is my duty to obey the call, as the expression of the views of a large body of the Electors of Edinburgh. In obedience to this summons I therefore offer myself as a Candidate.

I think it right to state that I do not seek a seat in Parliament to gratify my own wishes. If I were to consult these, I should infinitely prefer to remain in private life. Nothing but the hope that I may be, in some degree, instrumental in promoting the cause of our common Protestant Christianity induces me to comply with the request made to me.

Upon Political subjects in general I have decided opinions as a Liberal and a Free Trader. But most of these questions appear either to have been disposed of, or not to require an immediate solution; and, while I desire to promote the gradual Extension of the Franchise, the Complete Liberation of Commerce, and the Development of the Representative Principle in the whole of our Institutions, I cannot conceal it from myself that the great subject now forcing itself before the country is the question—Whether we are to maintain our Protestant testimony, or to depart from the high position which our nation has hitherto occupied as a witness for the truth of God?

By the Protestant character of our country, I mean, by the Divine help, to stand. I shall oppose the endowment of the Romish priesthood in Ireland, on the high ground that Romanism is the antagonist of that truth by which, if there were no religious Establishment whatever in our country, it would still be our duty to abide.

I perhaps owe it to myself and to you not to conceal from you that I am, on religious grounds, what is commonly called a Voluntary. But I do not desire to see these views hastily and prematurely carried into practice. While I shall oppose the extension of Establishments by fresh grants of public money to any religious body whatever, I do not wish to institute an immediate crusade against existing institutions. If the Irish Establishment, indeed, were to be made an excuse and a stepping-stone, by the Ministry of the day, for the formation of a Romish Establishment by its side, then I should feel that the time was come for religious men to seek at once the abolition of the one in order to the prevention of the other. But, except in such a case, I do not feel that my duty is aggression. Whatever changes may hereafter happen in the relations of Church and State, I trust, will be rather the result of the growth of religious feeling in the Church of Christ than of an appeal to principles of political equality in the State.

You will forgive me if, after a fatiguing journey and an exciting meeting, I postpone further explanations. I am anxious and ready to answer every question that may be put to me; and, if the result should be that you elect me as the Representative of your great City in Parliament, I shall consider it my honour and duty to devote my best powers to your service, and to that of our country.

I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

Your obedient humble servant,

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH.

The Christian News

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1846.

Dr ANDREW THOMSON.

The views of this truly noble man have of late become the subject of much controversy. The leaders and organs of that religious body in this country, who have become distinguished by their fellowship with slaveholders, are anxious, it appears, to claim kindred with Andrew Thomson, so as to identify themselves in public estimation with his well-known name. The friends of the slave, who demand his immediate emancipation, and denounce his enslavement as the most horrid crime, protest against this attempt to injure the honoured dead.—They regard it as a part of that sad manœuvring by which men who have placed themselves in a false position, seek to remedy the evil only by alluring others into the same snare. We join in this protest, and we give effect to it by giving, as preparatory to what will be still better, a report of a meeting which occurred in Edinburgh on 8th Oct., 1830. Let that report be read—let it be pondered—above all, let Dr Thomson appear alongside the men who seek to justify their fellowship with slaveholders by such distinctions as that between slave-*holding* and slave-*having*; and by lamentations over those who have first made, and now sustain the horrid laws of slaveholding states, and at the same time are proclaimed as the victims of those laws—men "finding themselves in an unhappy predicament." Let this noble man stand side by side with those who speak sweetly smooth things about the dear brother, who with the blood-stained whip in the one hand, and the earnings of his slaves in the other, finds a welcome among Scottish Christians. Oh, the contrast! Is it possible to identify the two classes of men? We answer *No*. Next week we shall be able to present our readers with a report of another speech by Dr Thomson, one of the noblest on record in this great cause, and we are mistaken if the circulation of that speech do not rouse the spirit of public judgment, and bring down its condemnation upon those who would take even Jesus with the one hand, and the American slaveholders with the other. Dr Andrew Thomson shall speak, and we sadly miscalculate if his tones of thunder shall not soon be heard on all the coasts of our favoured isle, waking up the now all but slumbering spirit of liberty and benevolence among the thousands of the armies of Israel.

MEETING IN EDINBURGH.

(From the Caledonian Mercury, Oct. 9, 1830.)

A meeting of the Edinburgh Society for promoting the abolition of negro slavery took place in the Assembly Room, George Street. At one o'clock the Committee took their places on the platform. On the motion of Walter Brown, Esq., the Lord Provost was called to the chair.

After a few words from his Lordship on the objects of the meeting, the Dean of Faculty (Francis Jeffrey, Esq.), rose amidst great cheering. The learned gentleman went into a long historical analysis of the horrors of slavery, and dilated with much power and feeling upon the condition of the West

Indian negroes. He concluded by proposing a series of resolutions for the speedy abolition of slavery, and that negro children born after the 1st January, 1831, should be free.

Dr. Ritchie eloquently seconded the learned Dean.

Dr Thomson, from the body of the room, rose to address the chair, and was invited by the Lord Provost to take a place on the platform. He, however, declined, stating as a reason that he meant to object to the resolutions. He could not in his conscience allow them to pass without stating that he did not agree with them. So far as they went, he thought them excellent and admirable, and that they did vast credit to the intelligence, and to the heart of the gentleman who had drawn them up. But they did not go far enough, and their premises warranted a conclusion much more extensive than that to which they had come. (Cheers.) They said that slavery was an evil which should be absolutely abolished. When was this doubted? If they went no farther, they had not moved an inch from where they were many years ago. Again, they say it should be abolished at the earliest period possible, and the earliest practical period. What did that mean? Just what nine-tenths of their opponents would grasp at. They would say they agreed with you; that they thought it should be abolished at the earliest practical and possible period, but that was many, many years hence. (Cheers.) He said they should have used the word *immediately*, and he was astonished that so many persons should acquiesce in the soundness of the principles laid down in the resolutions, and in the arguments by which they had been supported, and yet that it had not suggested itself to them that the word *immediately* was absolutely necessary. (Hear, hear.) He would beg this assembly to look to the history of this question. What had it been, in regard to the philanthropists of this country, but a history of vain and abortive, though generous, attempts to put down slavery? What, in regard to the Government, but a history of affected or mistaken confidence in colonial legislators, and West India planters —a confidence which had been abused as often as reposed in them? What, in respect to the Christian people of this country, but a history of sad disappointment and delusion? What, as regarded the West India legislators, but a history of hollow professions, deceitful promises, rebellious doings, principles and maxims which, if adopted, would go to put off altogether, and for ever, the consummation so devoutedly to be wished, the deliverance of 800,000 individuals from all the evils and miseries of West India bondage? (Loud applause.) Without entering into the details of that history, he trusted all present would be convinced, that if they did not go farther than was proposed by the resolutions, they would be compromising the eternal principles of justice, and putting in their place maxims of expediency—arrangements of pounds, shillings, and pence, and imaginary apprehensions, in opposition to the claims of religion and justice, and the dearest rights of men. (Applause.) If they argued about expediency, that was a point on which the slaveholders would willingly meet them. They would be glad to divert them from the principle, and battle with them about expediency. He trusted the country would not tolerate this for one moment. The slaveholders endeavoured to divert us from the idea of immediate abolition, by holding out the evil consequences of such a measure. They talked of the bloodshed and massacre which would ensue, and the brutal treatment they might expect from their emancipated slaves; and yet they tell us that their slaves are as comfortable and happy as the people of this country. If that be the case, let us take them at their word, and where will be the danger of emancipation? Were our own peasantry cutting our throats, or the throats of one another? Were the slaves then to resent injuries they had never suffered, or revenge wrongs that had never been inflicted? The argument, in fact, cut its own throat. (Laughter.) It was a mere bugbear. They were afraid of shedding a little blood. He would deprecate as much as any man the shedding of blood; but he would rather that a great deal was shed, if necessary, than that 800,000 individuals should remain in the hopeless bondage of West India slavery, which was an infinitely greater evil than all that

could be suffered by their opponents. There was no comparison between the two, if we must have one. (Great applause.) But then, we were told that the slaves were not prepared for immediate emancipation. He would say with the learned Dean of Faculty, the fault was theirs. They had known for a series of years the feelings of the country, and the intention of the Legislature; and why were they not prepared? Just because they defied the Legislature, and did not wish them prepared. If any evils were to be apprehended, it was a duty of the Legislature to enact such other contemporaneous measures as would provide against these evils, and accomplish the security of both masters and slaves. He held that at whatever period the Legislature should enact the abolition of slavery, their duty would only be half done if they did not, as far as in them lay, do everything to promote the temporal comfort as well as the spiritual and eternal interest of the slaves whom they emancipated. Nothing would be more easy than to make such provisions, and to guard against evils which might arise from the enactment. It was the opinion of every man that religious instruction was the best mode of preparing the slaves for freedom; but he would ask what had been done in this respect? The slaveholders professed to allow religious instruction, but their arrangements made it physically impossible for the slave to get what they pretended to give; and the inference he drew from this was, that they were unwilling that the slaves should be prepared for emancipation. Another fact he would notice showed this: A minister of the Established Church of England was actually persecuted because he dispensed the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to four people of colour, sitting at the same table with white people. (Hear.) There was one proposition in the resolutions which he could never accede to; it was one that, to his mind, showed the grossness of the system. It was the proposal that, at a certain period, the children of negroes should be born free. (Hear, hear.) It was an utter delusion. In the first place, it was indirectly sanctioning the principle that those who were born before that period were lawfully kept in bondage. He said that the same principle which declared the children free declared the parents to be free at this moment. He contended for the recognition of the principle which was the inspiration of nature, and the dictate of religion, that man had no right of property in man. (Cheers.) In the second place, what would be the situation of the children who were born before this period—of the brothers and the sisters who were still kept as slaves—(cheers)—were they to be kept in slavery because, in the providence of God, they might be born on the 31st of December, 1830, and those were to be free who were born after that date? It was nonsense, and worse than nonsense. It violated common sense and reason, and every feeling which we venerate as Christians. (Cheers.) What must be the feelings of parents subjected to the taskmaster's whip in sight of their free children? And what were they to do with these free children? Were they to separate them from their parents; or, if they left them with their parents, could they expect that they would be anything but slaves in spirit and character, though nominally free? (Loud cheering.) In the whole view of the case, he thought they would not do justice to their own feelings—to the slaves—or to the country, unless they went forward and told the Legislature that they must have immediate emancipation. They were a free and enlightened Christian people, and could judge of a case like this as well as any Legislature on the face of the earth. (Loud and continued cheering.) He would not recommend any violation of the constitution, or advocate the cause of anarchy; but he would say they ought to tell the Legislature plainly and strongly, that no man had a title to property in man; and that there were 800,000 individuals sighing in bondage under a vertical sun, and under the evils of West India slavery, who had as good a title to be free as they had; that they ought to

be free, and that they must be made free. (Loud cheering.) He was satisfied that, if they went forward with a petition of this kind, they would let not only the Legislature see, but the West India interests (which he was sorry to say was a great deal too strong) see, that they were no longer to be bamboozled or put off any longer. (Cheers.) The Rev. Doctor concluded by saying that he did not wish to divide the meeting by proposing any amendment to the resolutions; but merely to state his sentiments on the subject. There was a cry, however, in different quarters of "Move, move,"—and Dr Thomson accordingly moved as an amendment, that the word immediately should be inserted, and the proposition regarding children expunged.

The Lord Provost, as chairman of the meeting, begged to ask if the amendment was seconded.

Dr Ritchie remarked, that Dr Thomson might have seen that the sentiments of the meeting were in accordance with his own.

A gentleman in the body of the meeting seconded Dr Thomson's amendment.

Mr James Simpson, Advocate, hoped that Dr Thomson would abate a little of his virtuous feelings; he moved that the resolutions should remain as they were.

Mr Wilson of Trinidad made a few observations in favour of gradual emancipation.

Dr Thomson said, in reference to an observation of Mr Simpson, if he was an hundred years before the public, it was certainly a high compliment paid to him, and he would accept it. He was much indebted to the gentleman who spoke last, and who had supported his argument, by showing the vast superiority of a free over a slave population. The very iniquity of the system supplied him with an argument. They admitted slavery to be a sin, and yet they proposed to go gradually out of sin. (Laughter.) The farther they went the deeper, and he wished to plunge them over head and ears. (Laughter.)

The Lord Provost agreed that the best wishes of the meeting would be promoted by unanimity. He would cordially support the resolutions, but he would not go the length of supporting the Rev. Doctor's amendment.

Dr Thomson said it was difficult to reply to the chair. It placed both him and the chair in an awkward predicament, but still, in justice to himself, it was necessary to do so. When the word "bloodshed" was used it was apt to be misunderstood. He went upon the principles which guided nations in cases of war. He would suppose that a foreign nation takes possession of a small spot belonging to this country. Then what would we do? We would negociate, no doubt; but suppose the oppressor persisted, would not the Lord Provost say, we ought to go to war to recover it? The notion of war, it appeared, was not frightful, but the word "bloodshed" was, and yet was not the consequence of war bloodshed? We had here negociated too long, and now we must advance. We had here a moral principle, a point of everlasting justice, and was he to be told that when he was for asserting this, at whatever expense, he was doing wrong? No such thing! It was because the principles of eternal justice were violated that there was so much bloodshed. (Cheers.) If the Colonial Legislatures rebel because we insist on the rights of the slaves, and blood be shed in consequence, the guilt was theirs, not ours, (cheers) and let theirs be the punishment.

The gentleman who had supported the Doctor's amendment again rose in support of the Doctor's arguments, and concluded by quoting the Latin proverb: "fiat justitia ruat cœlum."

The Lord Provost here rose, and said, I cannot allow such language and sentiments to be addressed to me. His lordship immediately left the room.

A scene of tumult now ensued. Cries for Dr Thomson, Dr Ritchie, and Dr M'Crie, were incessant, to take the chair.

Some of the committee proclaimed aloud "the meeting is dissolved," but several objected.

As no gentleman could be prevailed upon to take the chair, it was at length agreed that another meeting should be held on Thursday next, to consist of those exclusively in favour of immediate emancipation.

A committee being named, with power to add to their number, the company separated about a quarter before six o'clock.

The Christian News

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 1846.

Liberty.

MEETING OF THE EDINBURGH SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY, IN 1830.

On Tuesday, (19th Oct., 1830,) a meeting of the Edinburgh Society for the abolition of slavery was held, pursuant to advertisement, in the Assembly Rooms, George Street. The great room was excessively crowded in every part, many ladies and gentlemen having taken their places before twelve o'clock; and by the time the chair was taken, there were certainly not fewer than twelve hundred persons present. On the platform were the Reverend Drs Thomson, Ritchie, and Muirhead, Reverend Messrs Buchanan, Petrie, Paxton, Gould, and M'Lean; Mr Howison Crawford, Mr John Wigham, jun.; Dr Greville, &c.

Mr More was requested to take the chair. The Rev. Mr Buchanan of Leith then read a letter from the Rev. Edward Craig, expressive of his regret at not being able to attend the meeting, in consequence of inflammatory cold. The duty of moving the resolutions consequently devolved upon Mr Buchanan, in absence of Mr Craig.

After a few prefatory remarks, Mr Buchanan then read the following resolutions:—

"That to hold a fellow-creature in bondage as a slave, is contrary to natural right, to the just spirit of the British constitution, and to the equitable and humane principles of revealed religion.

"That years of unexampled patience, and anxious waiting upon fair but failing promises, have proved that a system so opposed to the first principles of equity, leads unavoidably in its details to other revolting acts of inhumanity and wrong, against which the voice of the British nation, both in and out of Parliament, has hitherto been raised in vain; and for the prevention of which no laws can effectually provide.

"That the forlorn state of the negro slave, both as to the helplessness of remedying the minor ills which he suffers, and as to the radical and inexcusable injustice done to him, in the infliction of his bondage, calls loudly upon his fellow-subjects and brethren for the administration of ample and consolatory redress.

"That the attempt to prop up, by heavy imposts, a system of crime and misery, against which justice and humanity equally revolts, and which would otherwise fall to pieces by its own natural tendency to decay, appears to this meeting to be an absurdity in legislation which ought not to continue; and that the burden of such levies is a burden to the conscience, to which Christian men should be resolutely unwilling to submit.

"That the meeting, satisfied that no amelioration of the state of the slave can ever make his bondage just; and no mitigation of his sufferings should ever make it tolerable; satisfied that the resolute persistency to hold the slave in bonds must ultimately endanger the property, if not the existence of his white master; satisfied, also, that to do justice, however tardily, is the only way to avert those evils which wrong-doing inevitably entails; and that to do justice, at the soonest possible period, is the best way both to secure the well-being of the oppressed, and to relieve the consciences of all those involved, more nearly or remotely, in the oppression; and conscious that the instant and unqualified abandonment of all evil is absolutely demanded by the sublime and unbending principles of revealed truth: Resolves, to petition the British Legislature for the immediate abolition of slavery throughout all the Colonial dependencies of the empire.

"That this meeting can perceive no injury likely to arise to the slave-holders, or to the interests of the country generally, from the immediate procedure to this act of simple and absolute justice, already too long delayed; but desirous to concede every proper measure for security to those who might in the crisis of a change so extensive anticipate danger to their persons, or the loss of their lawful possessions: Resolves, also, to petition the Legislature to pass those enact[illegible]nts for the municipal control, the moral

improvement, and the religious instruction of the negroes, which shall secure to the Colonial landholders, as far as may be, in a free population, the due and prosperous cultivation of their estates; and substitute for the mutual hatred and mistrust of the tyrant and the slave, and the unsound and dangerous state of society which arises out of such relations, that safer and happier system of mutual aid and protection, which is founded on the recognised and well-balanced rights of master and servant."

The Rev. Dr Gordon seconded the resolutions, which were passed unanimously.

A gentleman in one of the windows stated that he had been several years in the West Indies, and wished to read to them merely what he had put down in his calm moments.

Dr Ritchie submitted, that no person was allowed to speak who was not a member of the society.

The gentleman still showed a determination to gain a hearing.

Dr Thomson said, he considered this interruption as most extraordinary. This is a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society. (Cries of No, no.) It is a meeting called by the committee of that society for a special purpose, and any person, not a member of the society, had no right to speak, nor was it expected that any would offer. (Great confusion, cheering and hissing.) He would just ask, was it to be tolerated that any person who pleased should step forward, and interrupt the proceedings—perhaps defeat the very object for which they had assembled—all-important as it was. (A voice cried out, "You did the same thing yourself.") Dr Thomson—That is a mistake. I was a member of the society. (Confusion.) I spoke as a member of the society, and if any member of the society present chooses to deliver his sentiments, I will be the last man to interrupt him—though his views were as opposed to mine as light is to darkness, or as the east is to west; but very different is the case of a person who has no right or title under heaven to speak one word; and whose object may be to defeat the very purpose of our meeting. (Great cheering.)

The Chairman then read the notice calling the meeting, and said that he would be grossly out of order if he permitted any other but a member of the society to deliver his sentiments.

Dr Thomson—I beg to submit to this meeting a petition, which has been prepared with a view to be laid before both houses of Parliament, founded on the resolutions agreed to at the former meeting, for the purpose of asking the Legislature to grant what we consider to be absolutely necessary, under the present circumstances of the slavery question; and I begin with reading the petition, as it may be the means of removing certain misapprehensions and misrepresentations, circulated respecting the principles which we maintain in the object which we pursue.

The Rev. Doctor then read the petition, which, after alluding to what was done in 1823, and to the subsequent ineffectual attempts at arrangement, proceeded to state that—

"They can no longer be deluded by the hope that a protracted period of waiting will ever bring them nearer to that object, which your most honourable house has resolved to attain; and trust that the Legislature, convinced also of the utter inefficiency of delay, is at length prepared to adopt such measures as shall sustain throughout the empire its high dignity, and secure the due fulfilment of its will.

"That the voice of a disappointed and impatient nation now calls loudly for some prompt and comprehensive measure to redress the bondman's wrongs; and that your petitioners, as a part of that nation, can no longer repress the full and earnest expression of their conviction,—that man cannot hold property in man—that slavery is a violation of the principles of natural right, and of the laws of revealed religion—that it involves severities on the part of the slaveholder, and sufferings on the part of the slave, which no laws can prevent—that to keep up by taxation a system so essentially iniquitous, ought to be felt as an intolerable burden, both by the legislators and the people—that all attempts at palliative and preparatory measures, while the unjust and immoral principle of the system remains, must be delusive, and have hitherto only mocked the sufferings of the slave—rivetted the prejudices, and consolidated the opposition of the slaveholder; and left upon the nation the unmitigated guilt of these flagrant wrongs; and

that nothing less can satisfy the demands of eternal justice than the full and absolute termination of the evil.

"That your petitioners therefore do approach your most honourable house, not only with a deep feeling of compassion for 800,000 oppressed and suffering slaves; but under the heavier impression of a conscience burdened with the guilt of participation in the iniquitous oppression; and with all the energy with which a petitioning people can respectfully urge a representative Legislature, do implore your most honourable house, in its wisdom to adopt effectual measures for the immediate and total abolition of slavery throughout the colonies of the empire.

"And that, at the same time, your petitioners, equally anxious for the safety and improvement of the black population, and for the securing to the white inhabitants the uninjured and peaceful enjoyment of their legitimate possessions, do also petition your most honourable house, contemporaneously with the decree for the abolition of slavery, to make such provisional enactments as shall be necessary or expedient for protecting the white population, if their safety shall appear to be endangered—for promoting the temporal welfare, and moral improvement of the negroes; and in general for securing the interests of all parties who may be affected by the great measure of emancipation."

I was anxious (continued the Reverend Doctor) that the meeting should hear in the outset the concluding part of the petition; because it goes to contradict the misapprehensions and misrepresentations formerly alluded to. When, in virtue of my right as a member of the society, I did take the liberty of moving an amendment upon the resolutions that were proposed at the former meeting, I did say that I desiderated the word "immediate" to these resolutions; but it must be in the recollection of every man who was present on that occasion, that I did qualify that declaration by the declaration of those sentiments which are now contained in the conclusion of that petition. I am the more anxious that this should be known, because not only the enemies of the abolition of slavery have laid hold of that single word, and severed it most cruelly and unjustly from its proper accompaniments; but even those who have chosen to differ from us, have in their advertisement changed the word "immediate" into "instant," and taken good care to cut away from it those circumstances by which it was qualified the other day. I complain of this, not on my own account merely, but on account of the great cause in which we are all concerned. I have to complain also, that after the meeting of committee, which was held yesterday, some of those members who now dissent from us, came to us and solicited our funds to help them in carrying their own petition into effect. They have this day circulated out of doors an advertisement, as unjust and improper as the circumstance to which I have alluded. I say this merely to warn you against a system of acting, dishonourable in itself, and injurious to the great cause which we all have in view. A great many persons at the former meeting took alarm at the word immediate, and sent it abroad, that we proposed that the Government or the Legislature should pass an order in Council, that some persons, armed with their authority, should go a trip to the West Indies, and say to the slaves, "You are all free." That is utter nonsense. Such an idea never entered into the mind of a human being connected with this society. The word is a strong word, no doubt, but it is contrasted with the word "gradual," and if we were to criticise the word gradual, we would come to the conclusion, that the abolition of slavery never would take place. "Immediate," they say, is gone before your petition can reach Parliament. This is absolute nonsense. If I should say to my servant, you must go to the south side of the town with a message for me immediately, would he not fulfil my commands, although he would not go in the situation in which he might be placed—without his hat, coat, or shoes? It is perfectly simple—it is not a metaphysical subject; we are to consider the word immediate in the common sense of the term, and to consider it accompanied with those resolutions which are now submitted

to the meeting. Our resolutions, and the petition which is proposed for your acceptance, are founded on those great principles, which all agree in maintaining to be the only right principles of humane and Christian conduct. The principle is, that no man can have a right of property in man; that if any man has a property in man, he must be able to uphold it, and to prove that God has given him that property. If the white man can have property in the black man, then the reverse is the case that the black man can have property in the white. The proposition sets all things into absolute confusion. We say that slavery is hostile to the essential rights of man—contrary to the first principles of justice between man and man—at eternal variance with the purposes of our holy religion, and bears upon it the curse of Almighty God! And if we indulge in any thing of that kind, we are guilty of sin, and for which sin there must be an awful responsibility before us. And now we come to the plausible reasoning of the slaveholders, who say, "We are blameless; we have not made them slaves." If they have not made them slaves in one sense, they have made them slaves in another sense. They have taken them as slaves, or received them in some way or other, in the capacity of slaves. If it is unlawful, unjust, and unchristian to steal a man, and put him in the bondage of slavery, it is just as unlawful, iniquitous, and unchristian, to keep him in that state. When you consider this, you must say that we stand upon ground that is invulnerable, and upon a foundation built of everlasting materials, linked to the throne of the eternal God, and which must endure for ever. We stand on these principles, and although we do not blink from the argument of expediency, yet it must be lost sight of when we come to the consideration—"What are we to do as moral and human beings? There cannot be two opinions on the subject; and if we act on this principle, and not on paltry views of expediency, we ought to use our efforts to put an end to slavery immediately. We ought not to continue in our guilt one moment longer than we can help it. I do not go to arraign the conduct of all West Indian planters; many of them are humane and excellent persons, and I believe it is their study to make their slaves as comfortable as slaves can be. I do not dwell upon the atrocities that may have taken place, and which have spread about among us; perhaps some of these are mistaken in point of fact; perhaps some of them are exaggerated and misrepresented. I can afford to part with every one of these accounts, and I just return to this grand principle, that man cannot have property in man. But I am not disposed to admit that in the whole, or in a great degree, slaves can be comfortable and happy, as sensitive and intellectual beings. Just the contrary must take place. Although I do not dwell on the series of atrocities that must have taken place, certain facts that may be mentioned, may be taken as indicative of what slavery is in our colonial dependencies. I shall mention a few of them. Think of the state of society where this can be found. A female slave runs away; she is advertised to belong to an unmarried lady, and the advertisement says,—"Run away, Mary Smith"—and what is the aggravation? It is this. "It is strangely suspected that the said slave is harboured and concealed by her husband, William Smith." Now observe, it was considered criminal in the poor slave to go to her husband, and criminal in the husband to receive his care-worn and suffering wife. Another case I will mention, to show the idea of justice that prevails in our colonial dependencies. In Jamaica, Mr Ady has his house entered by thieves—he desires one of his slaves to take his loaded gun, and scare them away—the poor man does as he is commanded, he dare not disobey—he fires at random, and unfortunately kills one of the thieves. Well, what is the consequence? Not the master who commanded the slave, that dared not to disobey him for fear of the cart whip, but the poor slave himself is apprehended—tried, and found guilty of man-slaughter—sentenced to hard labour for twelve months—and flogged with thirty-nine lashes in going into jail, and with thirty-nine lashes on coming ou The court before passing sentence, took occasion to obser that it considered the master as much to blame as the sla and agreed that it would endeavour to make him suffer by

sentence passed on the slave! What do you think of this? The want of the slave's labour for twelve months being considered a sufficient punishment to the master, for the crime which the slave was thus commanded to perpetrate. And, observe, it was by the evidence of the master alone that the slave was condemned; slaves not being permitted to give evidence. Take again the case of arbitrary punishment, which will show you what idea slave proprietors have of humanity. The Colonial Legislature pass an act in 1826, which they produce as a proof of their humanity, which is just a repetition of the acts of 1788 and 1816. It states, that in order to restrain arbitrary punishment, no slave shall receive more than ten lashes at one time, and for one offence, unless the owner, guardian, assignee, director, or overseer, shall be present; and that no such owner, guardian, assignee, director, or overseer, shall punish his slave, at any time, with more than thirty-nine lashes on the same day, nor until the delinquent has recovered from his former punishment, under a penalty of not less than £10, and not more than £20. All the persons whom I have enumerated were entitled to inflict this punishment, either for an offence, or for no offence, and who are amenable to no court on earth; and all this is represented as a most edifying manifestation of the utter abhorrence of slavery of the West India Association—of their anxiety to do justice to the poor slaves—and to restrain arbitrary punishment. Now you shall have some idea of what they consider indulgence to the slaves, and this is mentioned to show that they are not cruel to them. It is stated that they allow them draughts of water when they are at work in the fields. Then, again, mothers having three children have every Saturday afternoon allotted to them; and every woman having eight children shall be allowed Thursday to look after them. What do you think of the humanity of the system now? But here comes the worst case of all; that of the Mosses. I do not give my own account of it; I give the account of Mr Huskisson, who at that time was Colonial Secretary of State, and to whom all the information was communicated on the subject. Kate, a domestic servant, was accused of disobedience; on the 22d July, 1826, she was confined in the stocks, and was not released till the 8th of August following. The stocks were so constructed that she could not lie down at pleasure—she was flogged repeatedly during this time; and red pepper was rubbed in her eyes, to prevent her from sleeping. Tasks were given her also to perform, and because she could not accomplish them, she was flogged. She complained of having fever, which the medical attendant, who was sent for, said he was unable to discover, upon which directions were given to the driver, who took her to the negro-house and flogged her again; and at seven next morning she was driven out to work in the fields, which this poor creature never had been accustomed to, and she died at noon! Mark what follows. We are looking to the system and not to the case of individual cruelty. Mr and Mrs Moss were indicted for the murder of this slave. The grand jury did not find a bill against them for the murder, on what grounds I never could discover; for I have read the evidence, and am of opinion that there is not a jury in this country but would have found a true bill against them. A bill however was found against them, for misdemeanour, by the Petty Jury; upon which the court sentenced Mr and Mrs Moss to imprisonment for five months, and Mr Moss to a fine of £300, over and above the costs of prosecution. The punishment was inflicted, but an interference was made on the part of all the respectable inhabitants of the place, to get the punishment mitigated; and for this purpose, General Grant transmitted a petition to Government, which was refused. All the respectable inhabitants, notwithstanding, visited Mr and Mrs Moss, and when they were released there was a general jubilee among these respectable inhabitants, because the culprits were considered as respectable, and persons who exercised humanity to their slaves!! I wonder what their cruelty would be? To show what slavery was I will not now refer to private authority. I will quote that of Mr Dwarris, the only surviving member of a commission appointed in 1804, who reported on

the state of civil and criminal justice in the West Indies. "The poor slave, (he says) if left to himself, is generally contented and happy. Possessing a spot to which he is commonly attached; looking to his master for support in health, care in sickness, and help and advice in distress and difficulty, the improvident negro, far from pining in misery, dances and sleeps, trifles and dreams away life—thoughtless, careless, and happily ignorant of his own unprotected condition, and of the impotent fury of the laws." Here then you have the slave, represented as on a level with the brutes that perish. He is not treated as a human being—no one ever thinks that he is responsible to God, or has a soul for which the Saviour died, and which is destined like his own to immortality. Here he is spoken of as a mere animal, which, if left alone, will dance and sleep and trifle and dream away life. That is not the nature of the slave more than it is ours, but the system of slavery has made it so; and this affords us another commanding reason to go and say that he must be immediately emancipated. (Hear, hear.) How often have they told us that we were doing harm to the slaves?—how often have they told us that the slaves did not care for liberty? But how do the actions of the slaves contradict their declarations? When the white people were threatened and endangered by the Maroons, they called on their slaves to come and protect them; and what was the reward held out to them? That very liberty which it is our object to procure to them. And these poor slaves, for the sake of their liberty, not only gave their toil and exertion, but endangered their lives, and shed their blood to protect their masters. We have been told that the system of slavery should be mitigated, and will be mitigated; that is to say, that a course will be carried on with a view to prepare them for ultimate emancipation. Our government sent out orders in council in order to promote the mitigation of the evils attendant upon slavery. What was the effect produced? Nothing at all! The crown colonies did little or nothing, the chartered colonies did absolutely nothing, and if anything was done at all, it was a mere evasion, or perhaps a change to something worse. In the case of manumission, which was regarded as an important measure, what was the language and conduct of the colonies regarding it? Why, said the legislators of Barbadoes, compulsory manumission is a direct invasion of the rights of property. This is their argument; and if once admitted, there would be an end to all improvement. The plan, they said, must therefore be abandoned. They set themselves against manumission. Even although I should say to them, "I will give you the worth of the slave in money," they will not accept of it, and give him his freedom; they will not allow him even to work it out. If you once allow that they have a right of property in their slaves, their resistance to this is justifiable. But I will not allow that they have a right of property; and we have a right to interfere with this. I have no doubt but that you may hear a great deal about mitigation of the evils of slavery, by various arrangements, by enactments, by persuasion, and appealing to the minds and feelings of planters; but after you have got all this, you have not in the least degree altered the essential nature of slavery itself. You have not made it less cruel—less debasing or less destructive. You may whitewash the sepulchre—you may put upon it all the adornments you can find throughout nature—you may cover it over with all the flowers and evergreens that the fields and gardens can furnish—but it is a sepulchre still, "full of rottenness and dead men's bones." Disguise slavery as you will—put into the cup every palatable ingredient which you can discover throughout the wide region of nature—still it is a bitter, bitter, bitter draught, from which the understanding and the heart of every man who has a nature unbiassed and unsophisticated, will revolt with unutterable aversion and abhorrence. (Loud and continued cheering.) Slavery is the Upas tree of the moral world, whose deadly and pestiferous shade casts a blight on everything that comes within its influence. The foul sepulchre must be taken away—the cup of pollution must be dashed to pieces on the ground—the pestiferous tree must be cut down, and root and branch cast into the consuming fire, and

its ashes scattered to the four winds of heaven. (Loud and long cheering.) This is slavery, and this is the only Christian and efficient way to dispose of it so as to crush it for ever. When you get your mitigation, you are farther away from your object than ever. It is not to the sentiments of the Legislature that we can trust; it is to the sentiments of the country at large that we look—to the progress of public opinion, and the prevalence of intellectual light. And, observe, it must be to the public mind, more or less influenced, by what is visible, or known of the atrocities that accompany slavery. Now then, get your mitigation of the asperities of the system—do away with all its prominent parts of iniquity—smooth it down as much as you can, and to a vast number it becomes valuable, but still it is slavery. When you speak against the system they will say, "Oh the slaves are happy," and yet slavery is lurking under this mitigation, and the public feeling begins to subside, and if it once subsides, tell me where and when it is that it will be again roused into operation. I must say for one, that although I sympathise with my sable brethren, when I hear that they are spared even one lash of the cart whip, yet when I take a more enlarged view of the question, I am tempted, and led to deprecate what is called mitigation, because it tends to perpetuate that system which will ultimately grow up again, in all its former dreadfulness, and wither beneath it, everything great and glorious in man. (Cheers.) And in the third place, what an argument you furnish to the planters! Your argument is this—mitigate slavery, and on that they are prepared to meet you; they are determined to disappoint you; and they will not take the best and most efficient of these measures to effect it; they will take all the outside parts of it—they will give you a smooth surface, and nothing more—they have ten thousand opportunities to exercise their sway in oppressing, grinding, and tormenting these poor creatures—there will be pangs that never can be heard of—groans and sighs that can only ascend to heaven; and we rejoice that the ear of the Deity is open to them. But, then, you never hear these groans—never witness those sighs—never know of those pangs; and the consequence is, that slavery still continues by the systematic evasion of the planters and slaveholders to cause it to continue. Therefore, they will just amuse you with apparent mitigations and modifications of the system, where, in all its leading principles, it remains as horrible as it did before. Think again how they have treated the orders in council, and how the truth has spunked out. The slave proprietors say, "Oh do this to please them," and the orders in council have not been obeyed, and will not be obeyed, and it is impossible to enforce them, for the planters can frustrate every measure of Government at home, and they have done so for seven long years. Above all they set themselves to prevent the introduction of Christian instruction; and here I must be allowed to say a little on the argument of slavery from Scripture. I think it a very easy subject, and I took the liberty of publishing my sentiments upon it some years ago; and the more I reflect upon it, I think my conclusions the stronger. I cannot see how any man can ever maintain that slavery is sanctioned, and not condemned, by the word of God. We are told that it was permitted in the Old Testament, and not forbidden in the New. We can dispose of the argument shortly. We do not deny that it was permitted in the Old Testament, but by whom? By the great Lord of heaven and earth, to answer his own special purposes. The slavery then was essentially different from colonial slavery, and it had the appointment of the great Proprietor, whose property is his own, and who disposeth of it as it seemeth unto him good. But, show me a man stealing a man, or a man made the slave of another, without the sanction of God, and if you do, then my argument is gone. But I defy any human being to produce such evidence. This disposes completely of the argument. But then we are told that it is not forbidden "totidem verbis," in as many words, by the New Testament. I may grant this; but observe, it is just according to the wise and prudent mode which the apostles adopted, and followed under divine direction, for preaching the gospel. They did not take it upon them to

mention every iniquitous practice that prevailed, and rebuke those engaged in it. Their practice was, under the direction of Heaven, to give such precepts and state such doctrines to the world, as, when acted up to, all those iniquitous practices must come to an end. Did Paul, the great apostle, attack Nero for the iniquities with which his life abounded? No; but he taught a religion which, if Nero could have taken into his heart he never could commit such crimes. Did Paul preach to the Romans against the practice of treating their wives as slaves? No; but he taught them precepts, which if they had acted up to them, their wives would have become their companions. Again, it was quite customary in Rome, for parents, according to law, to put to death their weak and deformed children, and not only so, but they could sell their sons three times over, when they could only sell their slaves once. He did not take notice of that, but he gave such directions which, if they had followed them, would have brought such practices to an end immediately and forever. It is just the case here. The apostles did not say such and such things are unlawful and iniquitous, and must be abandoned, but they gave such instructions as to lead their hearers to depart from them. It is said in the law, "Love your neighbour as yourself;" and if you love your neighbours, can you make them slaves? It is said, that "you are to do unto others as you would that others should do unto you." Do you obey this injunction if you make others slaves? It is said there, over and over again, we are to regard all men as our brethren; and is it a token of brotherly affection to convert our brethren into slaves? When the apostle Paul gives instructions to masters, he tells them that they have a Master in heaven, and he is no respecter of persons. And then what are the doctrines of Christianity? The first and fundamental doctrine is, that we are all equal in the sight of God whether we are black or white, master or slave—all on a level in our sinfulness—and that all of us must rely on that cross by which we are to be saved, on Christ Jesus who died for salvation to the ends of the earth; and that neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free, are excluded from the blessings of God, but are saved through Christ, and "Christ is all in all." And can we ever think of making that man our slave, or of allowing him to remain in slavery, for whose soul Christ shed his innocent blood, and who is entitled to look forward to the blessedness of an eternal world? To assert that the Scriptures sanction slavery is a blasphemous commentary upon the Holy Word. This is the view which was taken of it in the primitive church. Gregory, and a great many others whom I need not mention, did, in accordance with this Christian principle, manumit their slaves. I know of no argument more powerful than this, that the West Indian planters and committee, all engaged in opposing the abolition of slavery, do everything in their power to prevent the introduction of Christianity among the slaves. There is no denying of this fact. I must not be told of particular cases, where there are good men amongst the planters that would engage good ministers to instruct the negroes. I must not be told of the Rev. Mr Bridges going about baptising them, as if that were to give them religious instruction. I must not be told of persons from this quarter being appointed to minister to them; all this may happen, and little be done. But there are various facts demonstrative of what I have said, that they oppose the introduction of Christianity. Their reason is obvious. If you once could get a slave population to understand the gospel, with one movement they would cast off their bonds; for the spirit of the gospel is the spirit of liberty, in all departments of human life—a general—a pervading principle; "for whom the Son hath made free he is free indeed." Need I remind you of the case of Mr Hart, in dispensing the Lord's Supper—that sacred ordinance in which all are equally entitled to remember the dying love of Jesus—who, because he allowed four people of colour to kneel at the same altar with white people, a meeting of the whites was held, and resolutions passed against him, as if he had thereby undermined the foundation of West Indian society! Need I remind you of the persecution of the missionary Mr Smith, under which he perished—or of the destruction of places of worship, because

in them the truth was preached; and there the slaves wished to hear the word of truth. Need I talk of the habitual, and total, and legalised desecration of the Sabbath, which the slaves are compelled to make their market day. Add to all this, that the Legislature of Jamaica, in order to escape from the recommendation of Government for the religious instruction of the slaves, enacted that no place of worship should be opened before sunrise nor after sunset, well aware that no slave could then attend, having to toil from sunrise to sunset. All this proves that the slaveholders are hostile to Christian instruction; and so long as they look upon their slaves as property in the same degree as their dogs and horses, it is impossible that they should feel any desire for their instruction. As a proof that they do look upon them in that light, here is an Edinburgh newspaper, of October 1830, in which two estates in the West Indies are advertised for sale. One of these is said to contain 100 negroes, 16 mules, and 20 oxen; and the other 120 negroes, 10 mules, 10 oxen, and 10 cows, besides sheep and other stock. Do we really hear this in the metropolis of enlightened Scotland? In the very place where we are now assembled to consider the means of obtaining the emancipation of the poor negroes, do we hear them classed with horses, cows, and other stock? (Loud cheers,) Can we then suppose that their masters will care for giving them religious instruction? no; for that would just be the means of subtracting them from the other stock. I hope sincerely, and I am sure that if we do what we ought to do, that by March next, when the sales are to take place, these two West India estates will be of little value, as far as the slaves are concerned. (Cheers.) It is quite clear that if we wait till the West India planters instruct their slaves, we will just be like the poor simple man, who was found standing by the edge of a running stream, and who, upon being asked what he was doing there, said he was waiting till the river ran by. (Laughter and cheering.) We cannot trust the Parliament or Government in this matter. I have a great respect for both; but I place much greater confidence on the public feeling of Great Britain and Ireland. I have had proofs of the growing attachment of the people to the cause; but I have had sore experience of the indifference of the other two bodies, and that instead of going forward, they have been retrograding. I will give you some reasons why I will not trust them, unless the united voice of the people is raised in favour of emancipation. In 1825, Mr Buxton, a great friend to the cause, but a gradualist, for which I do not much like him, brought forward a motion in the House of Commons, that slavery was repugnant to the principles of the Christian religion, and ought to be gradually abolished. Now, if the Government and Parliament had sincerely wished the gradual abolition of slavery, would they have opposed and rejected this motion? But they wish no such thing, and therefore on the motion of Mr Canning, it was negatived, and in its place a series of milk and water resolutions were adopted. In supporting these resolutions, Mr Canning gravely argued, that slavery was not inconsistent with the Christian religion. Again, at the close of last session of Parliament, Mr Brougham, after a speech, perhaps the most eloquent, argumentative, and powerful ever heard within its walls, proposed to the house to pledge itself to proceed early next session to consider what best could be done with a view to the mitigation, and ultimately total abolition of slavery. This also was negatived, the previous question having been moved by one of his Majesty's ministers, and agreed to by a majority. And I beg you to keep in mind, that Sir R. Peel, in replying to Mr Brougham, objected to his motion, for this among other reasons, that it pledged the house to the final abolition of slavery, which he was not yet prepared for, till he saw the means whereby it could be effected. I thought his mind had been made up upon this point long ago, and if his Majesty's ministers are going back in the question, it is the more necessary that we should go forward. (Cheers.) It appears that his Majesty's ministers have not made up their

minds as to the expediency of even a gradual abolition, and yet we have been advised to petition for a gradual abolition, because, say its advocates, that may be obtained, while immediate abolition is hopeless. They have not made up their minds as to what application should be made to so horrible a disease as slavery; our duty therefore is to knock, and never to cease to knock, at the doors of Parliament, till we compel them—by constitutional means, remember—do not let me be misunderstood—to grant what we demand, and what we think absolutely necessary on the grounds of religion, morality, humanity, and everything that is most precious in the eyes of man. (Loud cheering.) As another reason for distrusting ministers, look at their partiality to the West India planters. Look to the Mauritius, which they have separated from its adherence to the East Indies, and placed on the same footing as a West India island; and by giving to it the same protecting duties, and bounties on its sugar, have added to our burdens, in their anxiety to uphold the system of slavery in the West Indies. The secret of these proceedings is just this, that the West India interest is too strong for ministers in the House of Commons, where they can command seventy or eighty votes—no trifling matter in the eyes of ministers, who have not been in the habit lately of carrying their measures by very great majorites. And it is inconceivable the efforts the planters have made in the late elections to strengthen their interest in Parliament. The Rev. Doctor then referred to a letter from Mr Brougham, which should have been read at the former meeting, in which the attention of the friends of abolition was directed to two measures, intended to be brought into Parliament by the West India interest; the first of which is to facilitate the transmission of slaves from one colony to another, an arrangement (said Dr T.) of advantage to the planter, but productive of misery to the slave; and the second to qualify planters and slaveholders to be governors of colonies. Mr B. was anxious that those measures should be known and watched over, and vigorous applications made to Government to resist them. It is impossible (said Dr Thomson) for me to answer all the attacks that have been made upon me personally, in some of the newspapers. Some of these indeed I disdain to answer. (Cheers.) They are dictated by personal malice, and deserve no reply. But whatever I find in fair argument I am always ready to meet it, and here I have something like an argument in a letter by my friend Mr Combe, which he acknowledges, and honourably puts his name to. (Mr Combe's letter was published in two Edinburgh newspapers.) Mr Combe acknowledges that we are right in the abstract principle for which we contend, but not right in our application of it. If it is an abstract principle that God has forbidden us to make slaves of our fellow-c eatures, the application of that principle cannot be wrong when we say that it is contrary to the law of God to keep them in slavery. But I am inclined to think that my friend has got his ideas of the application of the principle from the West Indies, where a Mr Hynds averred, "that all the evils of slavery were abstract, and all the blessings positive." (Laughter). If he had reversed the position it would have been quite possible to understand him. Is the cart whip an abstract evil? It is true that it tears the flesh from the bones—that is abstraction sure enough. (Laughter.) But where is the positive blessing? I know of none, except it be a blessing to give the poor slave just as much food as may enable him to do all the work he is called to do to put money into his master's pocket. The will of God is not an abstract principle—it is a contrite principle, which ought to sink deep into the conscience of every man who takes the will of God as his rule of conduct. But we have another instance of abstraction here. My friend Mr Combe says that "to emancipate them instantly would be to turn them adrift from the stay which has hitherto sustained them, and to withdraw the motives which have hitherto inspired them, without preparing them to substitute better from their own resources." What then are the motives which have hitherto inspired the slave? Is it the lacerating cart whip, the prickly ebony, or the horrible bamboo? (Hea

hear.). They were told that slaves would not work without the cart whip ; but what right had their masters to apply it as a motive of exertion to any being ? Did God give them a title to do it to men, who are as free in his sight as they are ? (Cheers.) These, then, are the motives which have hitherto inspired them. (Cheers.) As a proof of the necessity of gradual emancipation, Mr Combe tells us a story of man who had been confined for thirty years in the Bastile, and who, when liberated at the French Revolution, became more miserable in consequence of his physical powers being palsied by his long confinement." His eye, we are told, could not bear the effulgence of day, because its physical structure had accommodated itself to the glimmering of a gloomy cell. His liberators, we are told, would have shown more humanity if they had provided him with an asylum, suited to the state to which he was reduced. Well I say so they ought to have done ; but is the case analogous ? We do not say the slaves should be turned adrift without practical means being also adopted to meet the exigencies of the case. This is what our petition prays for along with emancipation. It is trifling with the subject to tell us gravely of the man's eyes not bearing the light. A green shade would have answered all the purpose. I would rather have my eyes hermetically sealed up from beholding all the beauties of the earth, and the magnificence of the firmament above, than be a slave with my eyes wide open, to look on chains never to be broken—on taskmasters never tired of oppression—to behold some of my dearest kindred enjoying those blessings from which I am for ever excluded—or others of them suffering with myself, under the worst and bitterest of all human degradations. (Loud cheering.) [Dr Thomson then proceeded to notice Mr Combe's argument founded upon the first French Revolution, and contended that if there was any analogy between the cases it made in favour of the emancipation of the negroes.] Mr Combe (he said) thinks that the West India planters ought to be compelled to cultivate the moral and intellectual faculties of their slaves. I am sorry that such a philosopher should make such an absurd proposition ; for how can they be compelled to improve their slaves when they tell you that they are their property, in the same manner as mules and oxen. If we were to adopt the burlesque view which has been taken by the enemies of phrenology, we would propose that all the heads of the slaves should be put into moulds, so that bumps might come out, favourable to the propensities and talents which we wish to cultivate and encourage. Then the force of Mr Combe's argument would be felt ; for we would have them prepared to receive any abstract principles which we chose to inculcate. (Laughter.) To talk of making it imperative upon the planter to instruct his slaves is equally absurd. As to the plea of compensation, this is a fair subject of discussion for Parliament ; but I confess myself hostile to the doctrine of compensation. It is brought forward by the anti-abolitionists, and in such a way as to show that they use it as a bugbear to frighten us from our purpose —as a check-mate to all our exertions. They say that the Legislature has sanctioned slavery. In one sense they did; but it ought not to be forgotten that the Legislature did not compel any one to embark his capital in such enterprises. If any man invests his property in any ordinary mercantile speculation, he must lay his account to run all the risks attendant upon it. And I say that when these men embarked their capital upon slaves, they ought to have known, and we presume, as we must call them Christians, that they did know that they were violating the laws of God. But Mr Combe in his letter says, that men are not perfect. Why, then, if white men are so imperfect—men who have gone from this country, where we must suppose they received a liberal and Christian education—as not to know as much of their Bible as that it is bad to make slaves of their fellow-men, what perfection are we to expect in the slaves themselves? (Hear.) We are told again, that the slaveholders are not gaining by the system—

then why continue it? And if they are gaining, why ask us for compensation? They have had all the gains of their iniquity, and it will not do now to say that we must give them compensation, for giving up what they have gained at our expense. We have been roundly taxed for upholding the system of West India slavery. We pay a much higher price for the articles they send us than we would do if we were allowed to get them where we could. There is a large bounty paid on sugars produced in the West Indies, and a high protecting duty on that which comes from the East Indies; and we are made, in all this, to pay the piper. (Laughter, and hear.) We are in this way taxed a million and a half annually, and yet they call on us to give them compensation! Besides, we pay a great deal more than all this to support a large military establishment in the West Indies; so that altogether we pay about four millions annually for the upholding of this abominable system. (Hear, hear.) They have long known that it was the intention of this country to put an end to slavery; and, as wise men engaged in a mercantile business would have been, they ought to have been prepared for the event. The Legislature ought to do what they are called on to do, by justice and humanity, and not to listen to any argument about compensation. We all recollect the struggle which was made to get rid of the slave trade. There were hundreds and thousands of pounds embarked in that detestable traffic; but when it was put down, who ever asked for, or thought of compensation? On what principle then would we give it here. The only difference is, that in the other case the property consisted in ships, and here in human beings—therefore the argument is all on our side. It is well known that in this country till not a very late period colliers were slaves. An act was passed to emancipate them, and there was no compensation given to their owners, though they were at once declared to be absolutely free; and yet in that case their proprietors had just as good a title to compensation as the proprietors of the slaves in the West Indies. (Cheers.) Now, where is the difference, unless it be that the one class is black and the other white? It is true that colliers have generally black faces, but they are not just Africans. They are however all human beings, and if compensation is right in the one case, it is right in the other. Although I have said that in my opinion compensation is not due, yet I will not oppose it; neither is there anything said of it in our petition. The door is left quite open. Let the claim be made, and let Parliament and the country dispose of it as they think proper. I admit that there may be cases of hardship, the cases of minors and widows; and I should be sorry if these were not properly considered. But I deny that compensation ought to be a preliminary consideration. Let justice be done to the slave, in the first instance, and that will be the best pledge which can be given, that Parliament will do justice to the slaveholders. There is yet one topic which I must touch on, and which I do with great reluctance; but I would not be doing justice to myself, nor to the great cause which we are met to promote, were I to pass it over here without notice. (Hear, hear, hear.) In the course of the remarks which I made at the last meeting, in proposing an amendment to the resolutions, I introduced the word "bloodshed." I was immediately, and without attending to the way in which I introduced the remarks, assailed, and publicly accused as one reckless of the shedding of blood. This is a charge which I then declared, and now declare, to be altogether unfounded. (Cheers.) And it came with a very bad grace from the gentleman, who a few weeks before had presided at a meeting of the citizens of Edinburgh, called to congratula e the French people on their heroic resistance to tyranny and oppression, and on the great political boon which they had wrested from their tyrant, although obtained at the expence of the blood of 8000 innocent persons, shed in the struggle. (Great and continued cheering.) Am I then to be rebuked, reprimanded, and put down—held out as reckless of bloodshed, because I made the supposition, that some blood might be shed in emancipating 800,000 of our fellow-subjects in the West Indies? (Great cheering.) But it

was not I who introduced the word, it was introduced by the opponents of abolition, and it was thrown in our teeth by the advocates of gradual abolition, in whose name his Lordship spoke. I took up their objection and was repelling it. On my part, I stated that I had not the slightest apprehension of such consequences; but I said that if necessary, I was not one of those who would say that we ought not to emancipate 800,000 individuals from hopeless bondage, because some blood might be shed in accomplishing it. Alas, that we should be told in the metropolis of Scotland, and in this age of the world, that liberty is not to be sought for or taken, unless in times when it can be obtained without the shedding of blood. I ask in what region, in what age of the world it ever happened, that any revolution, in which the rights of the people have been conquered and obtained, it had ever been done without such a sacrifice? And are we to be told this, while we have yet fresh in our memories the rejoicings which took place in this country on the fall of the despot of Europe, in the bloodiest of all the bloody fields which the late war occasioned?—the field of Waterloo. (Cheers.) I again repel the charge, and maintain that nothing but personal malignity to me could have induced those who brought it forward to hold out such misrepresentation. (Mixed cheers and hissing.) Gentlemen may hiss as they please—(applause)—but so far from pleading guilty to any feeling of the kind, I have from the first maintained that there was no such consequences to be apprehended, and the onus of proving the danger lies with those who have started this bugbear. The example of Hayti has been held up; but I say that it affords an argument in our favour. The revolution there was brought about by white men, who introduced the revolutionary principles of France, and liberated the slaves to serve their own purposes. But look at the Haytians as they are now, and you see a peaceable, a prosperous, an industrious, and so far as can be, a happy community. (Hear, hear.) Look now to the relative numbers of free blacks or people of colour, and white people in the West India colonies. In the Crown colonies there are 60,000 whites, and of free blacks 74,000. In the chartered colonies, the number of whites is 59,000, and the free blacks 70,000—making a total of white population of 119,000; and of free black population of 144,000. Now, what is the character of these free blacks? They are a wealthy people, some of them are of great opulence, greater than any of the white population, and therefore have a strong interest in preventing any excesses of the slaves when made free. They are more than wealthy—they are many of them men of intelligence, liberal ideas, and conversant with the subject of the government of states—they have established newspapers, in which they discuss this very question, and exhibit a power of reasoning which might furnish an example to some of the periodical press of Edinburgh. (Cheers.) They are, moreover, men of great loyalty, strongly attached to the mother country; and when the white colonists threatened to rebel against Britain, they were told that if they took such a step the free blacks, and all the black slaves would rise in favour of the mother country. Such then being their feeling, who can be afraid of the evils which it is alleged would arise from emancipation? Look also at the conduct and character of the free black population as compared with that of the white, and it will be found to be good—to be excellent. By a return made to the House of Commons of the number of criminal prosecutions in Jamaica, that of the whites was as three to one of the free blacks, although the white population is 15,000, and the free blacks 40,000. From the number, therefore—from the wealth, the intelligence, the loyalty, and the good conduct of the free black population in our colonies, we have the amplest security for a peaceful and bloodless emancipation. I have no fear, not the shadow of apprehension, that any of those frightful consequences will ensue from the course we are pressing on the Legislature. I deem them all chimerical, and got up chiefly for the purpose of deterring us from insisting on that act of simple, but imperative justice, which we call upon the British Parliament to

perform. But if you push me, and still urge the argument of insurrection and bloodshed, for which you are far more indebted to fancy than to fact, as I have shown you, then I say be it so. I respect that maxim taken from a heathen book, but pervading the whole book of God,—"Fiat justicia ruat cœlum." I hope you are not frightened, Sir. (Much laughter.) Righteousness, Sir, is the pillar of the universe. Break down that pillar, and the universe falls into ruin and desolation. But preserve it, and though the fair fabric may sustain partial dilapidations, it may be rebuilt and repaired. It will be rebuilt and repaired, and restored to all its pristine strength, and magnificence, and beauty. But if the argument is forced upon me, and to accomplish this great object there must be violence—let it come, for it will soon pass away—let it come and rage its little hour, since it is to be succeeded by lasting freedom and prosperity and happiness. Give me the hurricane rather than the pestilence. Give me the hurricane, with its thunders, its lightnings, and its tempests—give me the hurricane, with its partial and temporary devastations, awful though they be—give me the hurricane which brings along with it purifying, healthful, and salutary effects—give me that hurricane rather than the noisome pestilence, whose path is never crossed—whose silence is never disturbed—whose progress is never arrested by one sweeping blast from the heavens—which walks peacefully and sullenly through the length and breadth of the land, breathing poison into every heart, and carrying havoc into every home, enervating all that is strong, defacing all that is beautiful, and casting its blight over all the fairest and happiest scenes of human life; and which, from day to day, and from year to year, with intolerant and interminable malignity, sends its thousands, and tens of thousands of hapless victims into the ever yawning and never satisfied grave.

Cheering and waving of hats, for several minutes, followed the conclusion of Dr Thomson's speech, which lasted for nearly three hours.

Mr M'Lean, Methodist minister, Leith, seconded the petition.

Dr Ritchie moved a congratulatory resolution; and explained his conduct with regard to the former meeting. He said he was willing to take the lesser good, but when he saw an appearance of obtaining the greater, he was more anxious to obtain it.

Mr James Haldane moved that the designation of the Society should be changed into the Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Slavery; and read a list of office-bearers, of whom Lord Moncreiff was at the head.

Dr Greville shortly addressed the meeting.

Mr W. Ritchie moved that an association of ladies be formed to forward the objects of the Society, which was agreed to.

Thanks being voted to Mr More for his conduct in the chair, the meeting separated.

MR. WRIGHT'S INTRODUCTION TO MR. MICHIE'S LETTER.

(From the Boston Liberator, U.S.)

Melrose, March 28, 1846.

DEAR GARRISON,—I cannot now tell you of my doings here about Melrose Abbey, and other things connected with this sweet spot. I cannot now speak of the Eildon Hills, and my visit to them, of the remains of an old Roman encampment on one, and of Abbotsford, and of my visit to it, on the Tweed, as it winds around the base of these hills. I cannot speak of Dryburgh Abbey, the burial-place of Walter Scott, the Tory novelist, the despiser of the people—of my visit to it, and the glorious motto over the entrance, "NO AMERICAN TO BE ALLOWED TO ENTER HERE IF HE IS A SLAVEHOLDER." These I must leave, and copy a letter respecting the Free Church, I received the other day at Kelso. The Free Kirk leaders, in their speeches and writings, have boasted their's is the *purest* Church in the world. If so, what must the others be? You may be sure that the following may be taken as a specimen of their churches generally, as I have been assured often by their own members. No wonder Dr. Cunningham declares of churches, composed of men-stealers, that "their rolls of membership would present as large a proportion of converted persons as that of the Evangelical (Free) Churches of Scotland." And such combinations of men are called Churches of Christ. I believe one of the first steps towards membership in *Christ's* Church is, escape from these war-making, slave-breeding, slave-holding, toddy drinking sectarian organizations. They are "synagogues of Satan." But read the following letter:—(Here follows Mr. R. Michie's letter, which has already appeared in our columns, and which Mr. Wright admitted he had interpolated with "*running notes*," containing those remarks upon the Rev. Mr. Wallace of Hawick, which were so grossly offensive and libellous.)

R. M. is a well-known teetotaller, and member of the Independent Church. I wish to call attention to the fact, that in Scotland and England, the most dangerous position in which a reformed drunkard could place himself in society is IN THE CHURCH. There is no place in which a reformed drunkard is so irresistibly tempted to return to his wallowing in the filth of drunkenness as to join a Church, to become an elder or a deacon, and to associate with ministers. He would be more likely to become a drunkard in Dr. Wardlaw's or Dr. Chalmers's Church, and at their dinner-tables, than in the lowest grog-shop in Glasgow or Edinburgh; for the simple reason, that at the dinner and communion-tables of Doctors Chalmers and Wardlaw, the tippling custom is adorned with the charms of social elegance and respectability, and sanctified by prayer! while in the low grog-shop it is accompanied with all its disgusting filth and obscenity. These *reverend Doctors of Divinity* do more to make drunkards, and to prevent the reformation when made, by giving a respectable, pious, praying tone to tippling customs, than a hundred low whisky-dealers and gutter-drunkards could do. These customs are dangerous in proportion as they are made respectable.

Another thing to which I would call attention. It is a very common thing in this country for the *Churches to undo the work of teetotalism.* Teetotallers rescue a poor sot from his filth and degradation, and surround him with hallowed and saving influences, and bring love, and comfort, and light, to a broken-hearted wife and starving children. The reformed inebriate joins a Church,—tipples at the communion,—sees his brethren and sisters, his elders, deacons, and minister, tipple their wine and toddy, accompanied with prayer and social elegance. He drinks,—becomes a brutal drunkard,—loses affection for wife and children, and sinks to the lowest depths of pollution and social infamy, under the direct influence of the Church, the elders, ministers, and Doctors of Divinity. This I have seen and known in Scotland. More;—after the Church has converted the teetotaller into a drunkard, the elders and minister, who made him what he is, turn him out of the Church; and then the teetotallers step in again and save him, and cause the sunshine of love, peace, and plenty, to visit his family; and they can save him, so long as they can keep him out of the Churches, and away from the communion, and from the influence of tippling elders and ministers. This have I often seen and known.

Now, which are doing most to accomplish the mission of Chris-

tianity, and to make Christ practically the "Lamb of God, to take away the sin of the world"—the Total Abstinence Societies, or the tippling, sectarian Church organisations of Scotland, with all their imposing array of baptisms, communions, Sabbaths, solemn assemblies, praying, singing, priests, bands, and gowns? In America, which are doing most to make Christ a practical "propitiatory sacrifice for sinners"—the Antislavery Societies, who are consecrating reputation, property, and life, to rescue slaveholders and their imbruted victims from that "sum of *all villainy*," American slavery,—or the slaveholding Churches, deacons, elders, and ministers, with all their prayings, and preachings, and observances? Who are doing most to make the gospel "the power of God and wisdom of God," to save the world, to make Christ a practical Redeemer, and to save men from sin by His righteousness—the *Non-resistants*, who are seeking to root out the murderous principle and practices of war—to induce men to beat up their swords and learn war no more—to put away all anger, wrath, and revenge, and to love as Jesus loved, and to forgive as he forgave,—or those war-making ministers, elders, and churches, who hang, shoot, and stab men, women, and children, and give God thanks? Who can doubt? I do not. There is more of the Church of Christ in total abstinence, anti-slavery, non-resistance, peace, anti-war, free trade, and free suffrage societies, than in any sectarian, war making, slaveholding, tippling, monopolising church organisation on earth,—be they Baptist, Methodist, Unitarian, Presbyterian, Universalist, Congregationalist, Mahommedan, Episcopalian, or Catholic, or any other. These Churches have no power to reform themselves or the world. We are obliged to go out of these bodies into what they term the world, for help to purify them of drunkenness, theft, robbery, concubinage, and murder,—to purge them of slavery, war, and blasphemy. We must go to what is called the *unconverted*, for help to persuade the *converted* to cease to fill the earth with drunkards; to the unregenerate and unsanctified for help to persuade the regenerate and sanctified ones to cease from slave-breeding, slave-driving, and slave-trading; to the irreligious, the prayerless, and ungodly, for help to induce the religious, the praying, and godly, to cease from theft and robbery; and to those who are called INFIDELS, for help to get those who are called CHRISTIANS to cease from cool, deliberate, systematic murder!

I am a *Christian*, dear Garrison; and every day but increases my confidence in Christ as the power and wisdom of God to save the world. I fraternize with those only, as Christians, who are working to save men by the righteousness of Christ, *by seeking to make them righteous as he was righteous*, and who are seeking, as teetotallers, as abolitionists, as non-resistants, free traders, and moral reformers of individuals and nations, to make "Christ the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world," by devoting their all to reclaim men from their sins. I care not for Church or governmental organizations, or any human institution. Let them all perish when they stand in the way of man's redemption. I care not for observances of times and places. I would have *Christ* a principle of action within us. I would have "his mind,"—I would "put on Christ," so that for me to live should be Christ. In no other way can he be of any saving power to mankind.—Thine,

(Signed) H. C. WRIGHT.

The Witness.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22.

MORE HAWICK LETTERS.

The art of letter-writing is commonly believed to be one of very difficult attainment. To excel in it is no easy matter; to reach a high degree of excellence demands very various and happy endowments. There has just appeared a professor of this art, who has proved himself, beyond all peradventure, to possess the requisite combination of qualities. The individual to whom we allude is our old friend Mr H. C. Wright. This gentleman has already achieved no mean eminence as a letter-writer, and every new attempt adds immeasurably to his fame. To place himself on an equality with the most eminent of those who in former days have gained distinction in this department of literature, is not simply the destiny of Mr Wright; he is evidently fitted to communicate new features and attractions to the art, such as genius only can bestow, and to carry it to a pitch which it has never yet reached in this or any other country,—in this or any other age. Our readers may think that we are exaggerating Mr Wright's merits; we feel assured, that if they peruse the letter which we publish in our last page, they will freely acquit us of the desire, and even of the ability in this case, to exaggerate, and will grant that we have written in terms of inadequate force. Mr Wright's style is so perfectly original,—so completely his own,—that there is no mistaking it. His fine Roman hand can very easily be traced. His remarks on men and manners are of so *piquant* a cast, and of so singularly bold a character, that they cannot possibly be mistaken for those of any other man, among living writers at least. His remarks are not only bold,—they are new and original. So acute and penetrating are his powers of observation, that he uniformly succeeds in presenting those persons and systems on which he animadverts, in a new and entirely different phase from that in which they had before been beheld,—showing that the men who are universally looked up to as the greatest benefactors of the world, are, in truth, its greatest enemies; and that the institutions which were believed to be set up by Heaven for the reformation of society, are, with accelerating speed, working out its ruin. His epistolary effusions, moreover, pourtray in so vivid a manner his own character, moral and intellectual, that we feel assured, that though all else should be caricature, there is no caricature here; and that his happy genius, all undesignedly, has given such a picture of himself, so truthful and so like, as no other man in all the world could have given. His speeches, we believe, are rather dull affairs; but no one can prefer

a charge of dullness against his "letters." From the opening "Dear" to the closing "Thine," the interest of his reader is never allowed to flag. Literary beauties of every kind, graces of every imaginable sort, —shine and sparkle along his lines. The choicest expressions,—for choice they truly are, when the principle on which they are selected is kept in view, —the most unexpected and extraordinary turns of argument,—the most novel discoveries, and the most startling incidents,—all combine to give "unrivalled attraction," as the phrase is, to the epistles of Mr H. C. Wright. So great is their fame, that every one reads them; and we know of no one who has read them who does not entertain a profound and *just* impression of their merits.

The public have not yet forgotten the "Hawick Correspondence," containing the letter of Mr Michie, with the "running notes" of Mr Wright, which were so perfectly adapted to the text, and pieced in so completely with the letter which they were meant to illustrate, that the American printer, completely puzzled by the ingenuity of the annotator, and utterly despairing of being ever able to distinguish between the original letter and the "running notes," presented both in a piece to the American public. So, at least, Mr Wright says the matter happened. Nor can we greatly wonder that this result should have taken place, seeing we are unable to this hour, though we have now had the letter before us for some time, to say with certainty what parts belong to the original writer, and what to his ingenious and pithy annotator. There are, however, in the letter in question certain passages of a very sprightly character, which are far more likely to have come from the inimitable pen of Mr Wright than from that of his less-gifted correspondent; and perhaps, by following out this line of criticism, any one who thinks it worth his while may determine with tolerable accuracy a question which the American printer evidently felt himself incompetent to the task of deciding. But dismissing that letter, we lay before our readers to-day another from the same graphic pen, which has just seen the light in this country. The present document is not, like the former, the composition of Mr Wright in part only. It bears to be his from beginning to end; and certainly it is stamped strongly throughout with the unmistakeable character of Mr Wright's style and genius. We would beg shortly to call the attention of our readers to its leading merits.

This letter promulgates, not, indeed, in set terms, or in a formal manner, but still with sufficient plainness, a great and comprehensive scheme for the reformation of the world. The object is good; but what are the means? The first step in the accomplishment of this scheme is the complete overthrow of all the Churches of Scotland and England,—nay, of the whole

world. Let no sect or denomination, of whatever name, think that it is to escape. Mr Wright is most impartial as well as compendious in his anathemas. His sentence of utter extinction is pronounced alike on the Free and on the Established Church,—on the Presbyterian and the Independent,—on the Episcopalian and the Methodist,—and on the Church of the Pope and of the Turk,—all must be rooted up,—must perish. Every church must be pulled down, or converted into a cotton manufactory; every minister must become teetotal lecturer, or betake himself to some honest means of living. Baptisms and communions must be abandoned, as very absurd and silly customs; and the Sabbath itself must be driven out of the world. And why must all Churches be destroyed? Because they are all obstacles in the way of the salvation of mankind. "I care not," says this very comprehensive reformer, "for Church or Governmental organization, or any human institution. Let them all perish when they stand in the way of man's redemption." And do they stand in the way of man's redemption? This matter the writer leaves in noway doubtful. "These Churches," says he, "have no power to reform themselves or the world." And, again, "I wish to call attention to the fact, that in Scotland and England, the most dangerous position in which a reformed drunkard could place himself in society, is IN THE CHURCH." The reformed drunkard, then, must eschew, above all places, the Church. If he crosses its threshold,—if he assumes the office of a deacon,—if he associates with a minister,—if he sits down at the communion-table, or allows the communion wine to touch his lips, he is lost,—his perdition is sealed,—he sinks ten times deeper than before in the abyss of drunkenness. It seems there are two men in Scotland whose influence is baleful and ruinous to a degree exceeding that of any other two men, or any other two thousand men, in the country, and who make more drunkards than all the whisky-dealers in broad Scotland. And who, do the public think, are these two men? They are Drs Wardlaw and Chalmers. An individual, Mr Wright assures us, would be far safer in the lowest grog-shop, encompassed by all its "filth and obscenity," than at the *dinner table* or the *communion table* of either Dr Wardlaw or Dr Chalmers. But we believe we shall scarcely escape the suspicion that we are giving a caricature of Mr Wright's sentiments, unless we quote his own words, which we now do:—"There is no place in which a reformed drunkard is so irresistibly tempted to return to his wallowings in the filth of drunkenness, as to join a Church, to become an elder or a deacon, and to associate with ministers. He would be more likely to become a drunkard in Dr Wardlaw's or Dr Chalmers' Church, and at their dinner-tables, than in the lowest grog-shop in Glasgow or Edinburgh; for the simple reason, that at the din-

ner and communion-tables of Drs Chalmers and Wardlaw, the tippling custom is adorned with the charms of social elegance and respectability, and sanctified by prayer! while in the low grog-shop it is accompanied with all its disgusting filth and obscenity. These *reverend Doctors of Divinity* do more to make drunkards, and to prevent their reformation when made, by giving a respectable, pious, praying tone to tippling customs, than a hundred low whisky-dealers and gutter-drunkards could do."

What kind of machinery, it may be asked, would Mr Wright erect in the room of those institutions which Christ commanded to be set up, and through the instrumentality of which his apostles and ministers have been labouring, since the days of their Master, for the reformation of the world and the salvation of souls? Mr Wright would organise Total Abstinence Societies, Anti-war, Anti-slavery, and Free Trade Associations. These, the writer makes no doubt, would speedily accomplish what the gospel has failed to accomplish. Could he only prevail on the world to give these things a fair trial, he is confident that we should soon see the introduction of an era of universal peace and happiness. Before the benign and powerful influence of Total Abstinence, and such like associations, suffering and crime would take flight from the earth; anger and jealousy would be rooted out of the bosoms of men, bitterness and falsehood from their mouths; and the human family, delivered from the bondage of ministers, Sabbaths, sanctuaries, and sacraments, would dwell together in purity and love. Indeed, we are given to understand that Mr Wright and his coadjutors are doing a world of good in the meantime, and would do a great deal more were not their benevolent intentions and labours checked, and in many instances altogether frustrated, by those war-making, slave-breeding, slave-holding, toddy-drinking, monopolizing, sectarian associations called Churches, of which, till a "clean sweep" be made, the world will not have rest. No sooner has Mr Wright and his brother philanthropists rescued a poor sot from his degradation, and "surrounded him with hallowed and saving influences," than some minister or elder waylays him, seduces him into the Church, gets him to "tipple at the communion," and thus the man is a second time lost. The only chance of deliverance the poor creature has, lies in his being expelled,—a result, Mr Wright informs us, that not unfrequently takes place; though on what principle an association of tipplers should expel this one tippler, we do not well understand; but having had the good fortune to be expelled, he is a second time taken up by the teetotallers, and a second time reformed and saved. In short, their system, with all its present disadvantages, does wonders; at all events, Mr Wright has unbounded confidence in its sovereign efficacy; and

with those only will he labour or fraternize *as Christians*, who "are working to save men by the righteousness of Christ," and who are "seeking to make them righteous as He was righteous," even Teetotallers, Abolitionists, Non-resistants, Free Traders, and moral reformers of individuals and nations.

The same hand which drew so graphic a picture of *slavery* in America for the information of Christians in Britain, has drawn an equally graphic picture of the *communion table* in Scotland for the information of Christians in America. He depicts it as a tippling scene,—a kind of debauch,—addressed by a tippling minister, served by tippling elders, and surrounded by tippling communicants,—a most dangerous place for any man, a most dangerous place especially for the reformed drunkard. If he but approaches its precincts, he is drawn inevitably into the gulph of his old vice. We in Scotland are able to estimate the truth of this picture; but what are our friends in America to think of it? Did they not know the quarter from which it comes, and the amount of confidence which is to be placed in that quarter, would it be very wonderful though we found them roused to indignation at this supposed profanation of so holy an ordinance, and emitting a declaration to the effect, that if the Churches in Britain, one and all, did not forthwith exclude from their communion every man and woman who touched spirits,—who was not, in short, a teetotaller,—they would instantly renounce all fellowship with them? But let us from this learn charity and moderation. We have had two pictures presented of late to us, both drawn by the same hand,—one, of the American churches in connection with slavery, and the other, of British churches in connection with drinking usages. Is it unjust to apply to the former picture the standard which we find so just when applied to the latter? And if we do so, how much abatement will we require to make from the representations which have been made, on the head of America? and how much stronger does the necessity appear, to proceed, with all fearlessness, but with all prudence and moderation, in the matter?

Mahommedan Churches,—a plan, including the erection of a machinery for saving men of which the gospel makes no mention, and of which the apostles were altogether ignorant,—a plan implying the utter extinction of all the visible signs and symbols of Christianity,—baptism, the communion, and the Sabbath; and, apparently becoming conscious that there is no small danger of the world doing injustice to the merits of his scheme, and mistaking its character altogether,—in short, of pronouncing the scheme an infidel scheme, and its author an infidel,—to guard against this, Mr Wright, like the sign-painter, takes care to write at the bottom of the letter in which this notable plan for making men Christians by abolishing all the institutions and ordinances of Christianity, is propounded, "I AM A CHRISTIAN, DEAR GARRISON."

TO MR GEORGE THOMPSON.

SIR,—You have exhibited all the freaks of a petted and spoiled child. You have had a run of good luck by continuing to declaim against negro slavery—a subject against which you very successfully made your *debut*, and, finding your advocacy to be popular and to pay well, you had as much shrewdness as to take that "tide" "at the full," and it certainly led on to fame if not to fortune. You possess in a high degree the necessary requisites for a popular itinerant orator. You have a wonderful fluency and volubility of tongue, and few can equal you in the mere animal quality of untiring power of lung. These gifts, viz., of *tongue* and *lung*, conjoined with the circumstance of espousing the popular side of a popular question, made you, as a matter of course, a general favourite, especially with the fair portion of the public. You felt your position, enjoyed it with an exquisite relish, and became intoxicated with the lust of further fame, and fortune through your fame. The enmity of certain parties with whom you associate towards the Free Church is deep and rancorous, and I could mention very sufficient reasons wherefore it is so. They perceived the slavery question to be one which, by sophistry, could easily be twisted round so as to seem to bear against her. The design once concocted, it was a matter of little difficulty to enlist you in the cause. So soon as you appeared on this new field, the various parties to whom the Free Church is obnoxious, most rapturously hailed you as their champion, and welcomed you with louder plaudits than ever you were greeted before. If your laurels before grew naturally in the open air of public opinion, they were now forced into unwonted and unseemly luxuriance in the hot-house of party. In your unmannerly crusade against the Free Church you have stuck at nothing to advance the unmanly cause in which you have engaged. You have availed yourself of the subtility of logic, the fustian of rhetoric, and the grimace of theatrical delivery. You might, through charity, have been pardoned for having, during so long a course of training as a public declaimer, acquired abundance of the art of clap-trap. Although your errors have again and again been pointed out, and demonstrated to be utterly futile, you have again and again advanced recklessly to the charge; in short, though vanquished, you persist. Such conduct, perhaps, shows your chivalry in a bad cause; but it is Quixotic chivalry. It is the chivalry of a man who is fairly crazed and out of his wits upon one particular point. Indeed, in more points than one, your case bears strong analogy to that of the renowned and demented knight of La Mancha. The old adage "*Quem Deus vult perdere*," is very applicable to your case. You much resemble the foolish boy who killed the goose that laid the golden eggs. You have successfully insured an ephemeral current of false applause; and it may be have been rewarded by a golden egg bag from a motley crew—the idol of whose worship you at present are. Indeed, you are just the man for their money; but whose patronage will stand you in poor stead, when—as speedily must be the case—for "truth must ultimately triumph," your time-serving policy, and reckless prostitution of talents, shall have been clearly exposed to the more impartial gaze of the public at large? That man must be foolhardy who would engage in a cold-blooded crusade to injure a body of people who have made so noble, and almost unparalleled, a stand, even to the extent of much sacrifice, for what they conscientiously believe and feel to be most important principles of truth, as the Free Church party, by their late secession from the Church by law established, have done. Granting it possible that you might, through some crotchet, believe that the Free Church party had committed some grievous error, so very far from lamenting that such is the case, in the spirit of Christian sympathy, you triumphantly chuckle and rejoice over it as a busybody does who has found out a pretext for casting plausible aspersions upon his neighbour's character. Indeed you have discovered that you have a similar interest in the real or supposed errors of the Free Church, that the silversmiths of Ephesus had who made shrines for the temple of Diana. Don Quixote did not commit a more glaring, palpable, and egregious logical fallacy when he attacked a windmill in place of a giant, than you have done in abusing the Free Church party for corresponding with churches who admit

217

slaveholders to their communion, as if in doing so they were guilty of some previously unheard-of enormity. On that score the Free Church did neither more nor less than has from time immemorial been done by all churches, whether state connected or non conforming, without exception, except, perhaps, the Quakers; and you are quite well aware that such is the case, or you must either be culpably and ludicrously ignorant, or you are insane upon that point. My candid opinion is, that you are, at least, as much rogue as fool!

The crack-brained hero of Cervantes, in his innocent hallucination, roams through the world in search of suitable antagonists. I should be loath to disparage the delightful poetic dream of the Spanish romancer by instituting any comparison between the pleasing imaginary personage, the offspring of his brain, and a calculating adventurer like yourself. Fitter far would it be to liken you to—for, in a moral point of view, you are no better than—those professors of the barbarous science called the "*fancy*," now, happily, nearly obsolete, and, in the course of the onward movement of the age, about to be ranked amongst the "*things that were*," who erewhile were emulous to "wear the belt"—whose highest ambition it was to aspire to the dignity of "CHAMPION OF ENGLAND!" Truly, in no jocular mood—in deep, sober earnest—my conviction is, that you are far more awfully responsible, aye, and have more to answer for, than such men as "Dutch Sam," "Sandy Murray," "Deaf Burke," and the like; and that in wilfully and deliberately sacrificing your highly respectable talents upon the altar of Mammon, you are even less dignified. In swaggering braggadocio style, you have thrown out challenges to men who either cannot spare time to dispute with you, or, what is more probable, consider you worthy only of silent contempt; but if you really do want an opponent—and one who is willing to run the risk of being beat by you—I am your man; and if you are determined to *die game*, "Come on, Macduff." Your wisdom, however, would be to recant in time. If you exercise peripatetic philosophy, and "run away," you may "fight again" in other battles: but if you are determined to fight until you are slain in your present inglorious warfare, henceforth, as a public lecturer, your "occupation 's gone." But to forbear further jesting on so serious a subject, if you choose to attempt to break a lance with me, my name and address are with the Editor at your service. I am no phantom, but a real personage, who have lived and breathed in this nether world not many years fewer than yourself, and have both a "local habitation and a name." Firmly persuaded in the righteousness of the cause of truth, and the iniquity of your present proceedings, I am willing to discuss the question with you in the columns of any respectable journal. You will receive a copy of this by post, and if you choose to reply to it, I throw down my glove, and bind myself to give you battle through any medium you choose to select.

I am, Sir, your opponent, if you can muster sufficient moral courage.

Northern / Dresser / Warder 30 July

D. T.

Edinburgh, 13th July 1846.

218

MR. FREDERICK DOUGLASS AND REV. DR. SMYTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN WHIG.

SIR,—The Rev. Dr. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, South Carolina, who lately visited Belfast, made certain statements, injurious to the moral and religious character of Mr. Frederick Douglass, the fugitive slave. These statements being calculated to injure his usefulness, Mr. Douglass felt himself compelled, for the sake of his brethren in bonds, and in justice to the Belfast Anti-Slavery Society, who invited him to this town, and especially to prevent others from defending slavery, or shielding its abettors, by calumniating him, to call upon the Rev. Gentleman to come forward, and make a full and public apology, or abide the legal consequences of refusal. Messrs. Davison and Torrens, Solicitors on behalf of Mr. Douglass, demanded this apology from Dr. Smyth, intimating, at the same time, that in case of refusal, he must abide the issue of a civil action, which would afford him abundant opportunity to prove (if he could) the truth of his assertions.

Mr. Douglass, conscious of innocence, took this manly and fearless mode of procedure, rather than the more usual one of filing a criminal information, which would hinder the party complained against from putting in a plea of justification.

I have the pleasure of handing you, by desire of Mr. Douglass (who is now in England), a copy of Doctor Smyth's letter of apology, with which Mr. Douglass's Solicitors advised him to rest satisfied, as his only object was the vindication of principle and character, and not any consideration of a pecuniary nature. This transaction, Sir, is a noble illustration of the spirit of British law, which, as Curran said, makes justice commensurate with and inseparable from British soil, which proclaims, even to the stranger, the moment he sets his foot on our shore, that the ground is consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, JAMES STANDFIELD.

Belfast, 7th August, 1845.

(COPY.)

Dublin, July 28, 1846.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your letter, of the 16th inst., informing me, that you had been instructed, by Mr. Frederick Douglass, the Anti-slavery lecturer, to institute proceedings at law against me for certain statements made by me, injurious to his moral and religious character, I beg to express my sincere regret for having uttered the same; the more especially as, upon mature reflection, I am quite satisfied, that the statements I incautiously made, on the report of third parties, were unfounded.—Very respectfully, your obedient servant, THOMAS SMYTH.

Messrs. Davison & Torrens.

2-19

SCOTTISH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE COMMITTEE of the SCOTTISH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY have much pleasure in giving notice, that they have now secured as their Agent Mr FREDERICK DOUGLAS, formerly a Slave in the United States, and that he is to be employed in the advocacy of the great cause on account of which he has visited this country. The Committee hope that all the friends of humanity throughout the country will bestir themselves, and lend their aid in opening up places where Mr Douglas may have opportunities of pleading the cause of *three millions* of human beings who are groaning under the yoke of the oppressor. The Committee are assured that the people of Scotland are fully satisfied that SLAVERY is at once wicked and unjustifiable; but recent proceedings in certain quarters have revealed the fact that there are parties in this country, who, while they denounce *Slavery as a system*, are disposed to *justify* and *excuse* the *Slaveholder*,—receiving him to Christian fellowship, speaking of and acting towards him as a person who is rather to be sympathised with than blamed.

It will be the object of Mr Douglas not only to reveal what American slavery really is, but also to convince all whom he is privileged to address, *that the slaveholder is a sinner of unrivalled magnitude*—that he is guilty of the highest and most daring kind of *theft*—that he is to all intents and purposes a *manstealer*—that no man can claim property in his fellow-man without being guilty of *unmitigated villany*—and that *every slaveholder* is as much deserving of being excluded from Christian fellowship as the man who lives by sheep-stealing, or who pursues the daring employment of a highwayman.

The eminent talents of Mr Douglas are already so well known to the public, that the Committee consider any commendation on their part unnecessary.

As Mr Douglas will be at liberty to commence his labours on the 15th inst., parties wishing one or more lectures from Mr Douglas will please to correspond *early* with the Secretary, who will arrange as to the time when a visit from Mr Douglas can be obtained.

In name and by appointment of the Committee.

JAMES ROBERTSON, Secretary.

Edinburgh, 33, Gilmore Place,
4th August, 1846.

THE FREE BEGGING BOX; OR, THE GABERLUNZIES LOOKING AFTER THE SUSTENTATION FUND.

Scene.—A Country Village—towards the left a number of small cottages—the Parish Manse a little apart—in front of the Manse, and under the shade of a large tree, is seen a portly old gentleman reclining at his ease, seemingly enjoying his pipe and the fun that he sees going on. In the distance is seen the Church spire, peering over the tops of the trees. On the right is a sort of platform, raised a little above the ground, on which the begging group perform their various parts. Tammas, a gash-looking carle, with a good deal of waggery playing about his upper lip, stands prominently forward the king o' the beggars. He carries a large, hurdy-gurdy before him, suspended from his shoulders by a broad leathern belt. On the top of the hurdy-gurdy, towards the right, stands the sacred begging-box, open and ready to receive, while the hat of the beggar stands inverted at his left foot for the same purpose. On the left of the begging-box is seen a little impudent chattering thing named "Candy," in the character of Pug, playing off his monkey tricks, and indulging in a number of antics and drolleries, peculiar to his tribe. Immediately fronting Tammas is seen a growling bearish-looking animal (which goes by the nickname of Cunnybruin) under muzzle and chain. On the right and left are seen two cur-looking creatures (Gordy and Gibsy) playing the part of dancing dogs to the music of the hurdy-gurdy. Tammas, honest man, is grinding away at the tune, "Bring a' your maut to me," to which he sings suitable words, making a break now and then to give the word of command to his co-agitators. Around the platform are collected a few people, chiefly old women of both sexes, who stand gaping and staring at this to them strange exhibition; but alas! "the money comes slowly in." Apart from the rest stand two or three aged and emaciated females, apparently giving vent to feelings of disgust and disappointment, and lamenting that ever they had been cajoled to throw away their all for the furtherance of any Free Scheme. One poor old creature is saying to her neighbour "What's that he says?—bring a' your maiks to me!' indeed, no me, I've gien owre meikle already, I've herried mysel', I've beggared mysel', and a' to keep up a set o' greedy ambitious loons wha warna content wi' their former guid situations, but langed after better, whilk they ne'er shall get, and now that they hae gotten my last bite and my last rag I may say, they can pass me by, and gang owre to the ither side." "Ay! it's a' owre true, Janet, an' that I ken right weel, but they gied me routh o' lang prayers and bonnie speeches, till they robbed and devoured my widowed house, and whaur am I now to lay my auld grey head?"

THE GABERLUNZIE'S SANG.

Bring a' your maiks to me,
Bring a your maiks to me!
For, look ye, my wally *receiver*
Will tak while ye're able to gie.

How gladly I'll grasp at a shilling,
Nor will I refuse a bawbee;
To clutch a black dollar—how thrilling!
To help out the schemes o' the Free.
Bring a' your maiks to me, &c.

The dollar wi' *bluid* may be stained,
The shilling o' —— may stink;
The bawbee by thiefdom be gained—
What then?—let me see better clink!
Then in wi' your maiks to me, &c.

"Come, Candy, you little rogue, show the ladies and gentlemen a few of your most graceful grimaces, and let them hear how well you can chatter the last word I taught you." Candy, after performing a few fantastic tricks, leaps upon Tammas's left shoulder, holds out his tiny cap, and chatters out—"Ba—ba—ba—ba—bee—bee—bee—bee—bawbee bawbee—bawbee—bawbee—bee—bee—bee—bee!" "Well done, my little Candy, you shall have sugar-candy for that."

Come, leddies, come leddies, be gracious,
I'm sure ye're we'll pleased wi' our sang;
Come, jingle, our time is most precious,
And I maun hae *blunt* ere I gang.
Come in wi' your maiks to me, &c.

Ho, Cunnybruin! come, Sir, stand up straight upon your hind legs. Show the ladies some of your most delicate attitudes, and let them hear what you've got to say." Bruin slowly raises himself up, shakes his grissly head, and growls out—"Do—do—doll—doll—dol—lars—dol—lars." "Louder yet, Bruin." "Do—ll—ars!!!" "Glorious, Bruin, you shall have my blessing for that. What, no money yet? then I must shake the dust from off my feet, and leave you all to your own wicked ways .But I see it all now"—looking across to the manse.

Yon scant-o'-grace loon owre the gate,
May laugh 'neath his ain fig-tree;
But we'll lay the axe to it straight,
And levelled to earth it shall be.
Now in wi' your maiks to me, &c.

"Come, now, you two little doggies, turn to the ladies, and hold up to their view your empty begging caps. Now, ladies, here is an opportunity for you."

Yon bonnie bit steeple—I'm fain
To see't keeking owre the green trees,
And to think it will yet be our ain,
And we'll yet be the Sovereign Frees.
What! never a brown bawbee?
No—never a brown bawbee!
Ye flint-hearted sinners, I warn ye,
Ye'll ne'er get to glory through me.

A crowd from the village set up a shout of laughter and derision; the hurdy-gurdians scamper off in different directions, disappointed and dumbfoundered at their ungracious reception; the organ, in the midst of the confusion, squeaking out a few notes of—"This is no mine ain house"—"We'll gang nae mair to yon town," &c.

(*From the Toronto Banner, July 3.*)

We observe with deep regret that the Free Church papers in Scotland speak in terms undeserved of the abolitionists of the States. A much esteemed cotemporary, the *Scottish Guardian*, talks sarcastically of Mr Buffum, repeating more than once after his name, "the black man." The *Guardian* surely forgets that God has made some men black, and others white; and, when he finds fault with the colour of a man, it is the Maker he traduces, although he certainly does not mean to do so. We are aware, that, in the abolition party, there are men and women who hold most erroneous views. Lloyd Garrison has got some absurd notions about the Sabbath having no warrant in Scripture for its observance—about no civil government being lawful—and, also, about women having a right to hold any office in the state the same as the other sex. But it is well known, that, on account of these notions, and the forcing of them into the anti-slavery question, the great mass of the abolitionists separated from them five or six years ago, and formed a distinct society. In every great and generous movement that has been made for the improvement of fallen man, men of an ardent but enthusiastic turn of mind have taken a part. But the cause is not to be estimated by the character of some of its followers, but by its own intrinsic merits. Some abolitionists are said to be infidels. This may be true, though we have never met any, but have met many pious and devoted men among them. But what has that to do with the cause of abolishing slavery?

Reference is made by Dr Candlish and other apologists for the United States Presbyterian churches, to the state of the British colonies some years ago, where slavery existed, and it is said that no attempt was made to operate through the refusal of church privileges to the slaveholder. Now we appeal to all who know the history of the West Indies, whether almost any benefit could have been derived from that, for small would have been the number to operate upon, at least of those living on the spot. But the times and circumstances were widely different from the present. The mind of the British people in regard to the abolition of slavery was put in active motion, soon after the close of the long French war, and it made rapid progress. Good men of all Christian denominations engaged in the great cause of abolition. Many ministers of the gospel were extensively active and useful. We never heard of a single minister opposing it, although many looked on with indifference.

The ministers of the Presbyterian church of America have not so acted, for they have crushed the very discussion of it in their church courts till within the last two months, and their influence in society, which is very great, has been given to the slaveholder. The people of Great Britain saw progress making. The work received powerful aid from the fair sex, ever foremost in the cause of humanity. In 1823 the shameful power of the whip in regard to females was taken from the drivers by George Canning, and soon after the Sabbath day, "holy to the Lord and honourable," was given to the slaves, and then the half of Saturday to cultivate their grounds. No such improvements are going on in the States—nothing is doing to rouse the people but by the despised and reviled abolitionists. The slave system is presented to the world in the present day by hundreds of poor men escaping from bondage, and many shot down in the attempt, by the enactment of more rigorous laws, and by ministers of the gospel murdered in the name of law for restoring their fellow-men to liberty in a country which boasts itself as the only free one on earth. The world is in a more advanced stage since the abolition of slavery began to be agitated. Seventy or eighty years ago, when John Newton was engaged in a slave ship, it was not enlightened on the enormous evil of that accursed trade. Custom and the love of gain had blinded and deceived many an unenlightened conscience. A John Newton acting the same part now would be a much more guilty man than John New-

ton then. The civilized world has been agitated on the subject to its very extremities. Britain has abolished slavery. France is about to do it, and Sweden, Denmark and Holland give symptoms of following. Even Mehemet Ali, and some of the small Barbary States, have caught the noble flame, and rushed in advance of Christian States to blot it out from their dominions. Something is gained everywhere but in the United States.

There is one great mistake into which Dr Candlish has fallen from erroneous information, and on which his mode of dealing with the slaveholders is entirely founded. He admits that slave-holding is *prima facie* a sin; but he says, circumstances exist where it cannot be given up without committing sin. This is, certainly, a most illogical statement. Slavery is a *sin*, and the slaveholder being convinced that it is so, he gives it up by setting his slaves free. Can the act of freeing a slave from bondage be sin? Assuredly not. It is an act of duty and obedience to the commandment of God, and it cannot therefore be sin. Dr Candlish in designating it sin, we suppose, has reference to the atrocious law in some of the States, which prevents free coloured persons from living within their bounds. Consequently, if the owner frees them, they will be laid hold of by the authorities and sold again into slavery. Now, although there was no remedy for this, it would still be *sin* in the slaveholder to retain them. His business is to clear his own skirts of the crime, and leave the issue to Providence. If he and others were doing their duty to the slave by giving up all ownership, it is incalculable the effect it might have in the way of example to others. If by doing so, the operation of unjust laws should produce another evil, the sin does not lie at his door; but so long as he holds possession of the bodies of his fellow-men, he lives in open defiance of the law of God. When the martyrs confessed Christ, and were led to the stake or the scaffold, they were the innocent and unwilling cause of grievous sin committed by their persecutors. If they had denied Christ the sin would have remained with themselves.

We have taken this view to show the fallacy of the argument employed by Dr C., but there is no need for placing it on that footing A slaveholder can transport his slaves into a free State without hindrance, and give them their freedom, and there they will not be molested, except by labouring under certain social evils, arising from *caste*, which this singular free people delight to inflict on the coloured race. The doctor's theory about asking the man what he thinks of himself, and rolling on him the burden of proving "that he is not a sinner," is a delusion. The mere fact of his retaining slaves is an evidence of guilt, for he would send them to a free state, if he were really sincere, and did not roll slavery "like a sweet morsel under the tongue."

In no part of his speech is the worthy divine more wide of the mark than that when he alludes to the purchase of the freedom of the slaves, and pledges his country and h s church to do their part if twenty millions are wanted as in the West Indies. The idea of purchase is hopeless. The value of the stolen men and women in the States has never been estimated by them below twelve hundred millions of dollars, or two hundred and forty millions sterling. They take them at five hundred dollars a head, and nearly two millions and a half in number. When making this offer, the Doctor resumes all his natural fire and eloquence, but he makes no mention of compensation to the slaves. That was the great defect in the West India Abolition Bill. A large part of the price of freedom should have been paid to them, as a compensation for generations of oppression. The freedom of the American slaves will never be got by purchase.

But as sure as Christianity will be universal in the world, so sure will the chains of the slave be broken, for the one cannot happen till the other is accomplished. And the slave trade can never be abolished till slavery itself is rooted out from the earth. One whole quarter of the world is shut out from the blessings of gospel light and civilization, by the perpetual desolations of the slave trade. Slavery is a more dangerous enemy to Christian truth than superstition and idolatry. And

S S 224

No Fellowship with Slaveholders, &c. By the Rev. James Macbeth, minister of Laurieston Free Church, Glasgow. Edinburgh: C. Ziegler.

HERE, if we mistake not, is a tract that will tell. We hail it with joy—we commend it for the sake of the oppressed—aye, and with all our hearts—for the sake of those who are in the unhappy predicament of fellowship with the slaveholder. Though on other subjects of great moment, we differ from its respected author, for the sake of liberty, we will cheer him on in his too lonely, but exalted position, as a minister of the "Free Church of Scotland." The time is at hand when he will not be so lonely. There is in humanity that which will arise and speak, even from beneath the feet of leadership, though the leaders sway it all but absolute dominion. Let truth like this, and truth thus told, only be kept sounding, and the spirit of Scotland will yet respond, and rise erect for action. He who makes the wrath of man to praise him can make their pride, and their blunders praise him too; and we anticipate the time when those who are now galled by such pamphlets as that before us, will bless the man who has dealt faithfully with them in the day of their backsliding.

But we must lay Mr Macbeth's pithy words before our readers, and let him speak for himself at some length. Let no one dream that he has no interest in this, unless in regard to 3,000,000 of men he is prepared to ask—"Am I my brother's keeper?" He prefaces with the following words from the venerable Clarkson:—

> The little book you were so good as send me * * To say merely that I am pleased with it, would not be paying you the proper or just compliment. I cannot conceive a work to have been better written, or more to the purpose. It carries conviction with it in every sentence. * * I entirely join you in the opinion with respect to the meaning of "doulos" and "andrapodon."

He commences with the following most overwhelming charge:—

> There have been those who have refused to discuss theoretically the point of intrinsic evil of slaveholding; they have declined entering on that point, lest the argument should be refined away into nice distinctions; they have thought it simpler to stand on the broad atrocities of practical slave-owning; but the American apologists of slavery, and our speakers in this debate, occupy a very different position from this—instead of declining to take up the point, instead of cautiously refusing to decide it one way or other—they have rushed into it, and have decided it, with asseverations, in the negative,—that slave-having is not necessarily any sin on the slave-haver's part, or any wrong in itself—and they are the only parties in Christendom that have done so,—a new position, and one which the writer dares to think is contrary to the spirit of Christianity.

Our author next announces the important anticipation of a renewal of the debate which he now reviews:—

> There may be some among us whose impression is, that the subject has finally and completely been got rid of, and may now be put out of their mind, as if laid on the shelf: whereas, evidently, on the business-roll of May, 1847, slavery and fellowship with the American Church will occupy a prominent place. The question is not puny; the fair name of our church is concerned—the discharge of honest duty to our brethren, much longed for, in America; the deliverance from gross, unchristian, and demoralising oppressions, of three millions of our fellow-immortals—the cause of liberty and of religion all over the earth.

He points out the true character of the American Churches as sinning in light:—

Another circumstance is to be taken into view at this point, that this American Church cannot be regarded as a party destitute of light, and who should therefore be long borne with. The truth is, they are in possession of light, and are seeking to quench it. Is it of no weight against them their being citizens of a republic, which boasts itself the freest on earth? and in whose Declaration of Independence these words stand prominent—"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Not one of the old Greek republics proceeded on this principle, or knew of it; a republican slave-owner in the nineteenth century is a monstrosity, of necessity a liar if he assent to that Declaration, an apostate from the cause of freedom, of civilization, of common decency and consistency.

Our author next displays the spirit of paliation of sin which prevailed in some of the speeches he reviews:—

Throughout these speeches, frequent attempts were made to excite admiration of this American Church; to excite sympathy for it; a tone of apology prevails; aye, and of apology for much of what it does, in the matter of slavery itself. Said Dr Candlish, "They stand in a position, in some respects, of high superiority to us." He even ventured the assertion, that "the number of converted ministers and congregations is, I believe, greater in proportion than will be found in almost any church in Christendom." Suppose a person with a little caution, were to ask for clear proof of this, where could the proof be found? Again, said Dr Cunningham; "We have not against them a charge of heresy or sin, but simply a charge of short-coming:" and also, "I am not able to see anything like proof from the New Testament, that you can lay your hands upon any positive case of heresy, or distinct and indisputable sin, that they are practising." Again, "They come *somewhat* short of their duty."

Referring to the laws of the slaveholding states, he says:—

Then "the laws of the land," to which they yield in the United States, are a thousand fold more profane, than any thing Lord Aberdeen ever dreamed of. For instance, did his Lordship ever issue a command, prohibiting the ministers of the Establishment from teaching the working classes to read the Bible? Nothing so disgusting was ever proposed on this Scottish soil. But this is proposed and enjoined in the Slave States; this is "the law of the land" there; and to this these divines yield obedience—divines whom, to subject to some wholesome severity of treatment, is not harsh and contrary to the spirit of Christianity, as was said by a gentleman whom I warmly honour, but is gentleness and true love. No one pretends, that, generally, they break this law. In a very few cases, possibly, it may be violated in secret. However, a violation in a cowardly way is not enough; the violation would need to be open, avowed, declared, formal; lest the church of the God of truth should even seem to be perpetrating a deed of loathsome self-desecration, by obeying.

And, asks our author—

Is this what Dr Cunningham refers to when he says, "They come *somewhat* short of their duty;" and again, "They are not practising any distinct and indisputable sin; it is simply a short-coming."

Again,—

The point I have been holding up to your view, is the attrocious keeping back from the slave of the oracles of God. Take another case: the marriage of blacks.—A male and a female slave come before a Presbyterian divine. To please the slaveholding legislators around him, he corrupts and mutilates the sacred contract, uniting the two, not till death do part them,

or as he would do in marrying two whites, but while they may be permitted to be together; and, of course, not concluding the service with such words as these: "Whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." This is enormous wickedness: but this is but half. Suppose the master finds himself compelled in providence—let your sympathy for him flow freely—in providence, as he may phrase it, not in selfishness—to sell the female in a year or two—and the man wishes to have another partner—and, on that errand comes before the minister a second time; how will he act? The fact is, he will perform a mutilated ceremony a second time, while the former wife is living. This statement is not made hurriedly. Ask a certain divine in Charleston—not unknown in the literary world—ask him if he would do this thing—if he has never done it. When it is denied, the proof shall be at hand. It is impossible Dr Candlish can be in possession of these facts, when, explaining how the fierce attacks of the Abolitionists (of whom he does not add, only a smaller section indulge in fierce attacks) drive the slaveholding divines to an improper attitude on their side, he says for his church: 'It is at the same time, just such a tone of mind as I feel, would probably be ours, if we were placed in their circumstances." Let the Free Church reply: "We value our characters more, than we value the pleasure of paying a compliment to an erring church, sunk in a grossness of Erastianism unknown in Scotland; and we pray to God that such a state as theirs—which as one of its fruits leads ministers to mutilate the marriage tie, and so to poison human society in its sources—may never be ours. Sooner let the grave cover us." The supposition that Dr Candlish is not aware of the facts, is, I am glad to say, borne out by what his speech contains expressly on this point: "When, in regard to marriage, I say I do not know how they act in this particular. It does seem to me monstrous that a church should exist having any of her ministers and members living in a population, among which there are bars to the holy state of marriage—in which marriages are to be celebrated, not for life, but for a time, subjecting to the power of man to divide what God has joined together (great applause); that a church should have any of her ministers living in such a population, and yet consent to be supine or inactive, seems to me incredible." This is the whole of what he said on this subject; and it claims your prolonged attention. He does "not know how they act in this particular;" yet he does seem to have a painful suspicion of "bars to the holy state of marriage," and of "marriages not to be celebrated for life." Be it enough, however, that *you* know the facts. Besides, he justly brands it as monstrous, for ministers to be "supine and inactive" in such a state of things; but no couple were ever married by a minister supine and inactive. The minister must be on his feet, and be active. If, then, to be supine and inactive in the midst of such evils be "monstrous," surely it is "thrice monstrous" to be active in taking part in them. I go no farther—I enter no farther on the evils to which these divines tamely succumb.

We have noticed only one half of the book, and must return to it again. It is quite unnecessary that we should say one word in addition to what we have quoted. Our readers will now be prepared we trust, to read it with deep interest for themselves, and in a spirit even more thoroughgoing than that of the author, to do their part in that work of mercy, the emancipation of the slave.

Then comes what must be inexpressibly galling to the consciences of those chiefly implicated; a melancholy instance of the courses to which men are led by one false step. It forms his first head :—

Mark the circumstance, that though two very important documents had come to hand—they were both kept out of sight; and the debate closed without their being seen—the letter, namely, or reply from the American Church to us, and the deliverance of the American Presbyterian Assembly, which accompanied it. Let this be pondered, and kept before the mind.

Again—

Is it possible to avoid believing that the reply from across the Atlantic would have been read, if it had been creditable to those from whom it came ; if it had contained any avowal on their part of a resolution to break the slave-laws; if it had not been such as would have strongly tended to sway the Assembly's conclusion, and to convince the house that the moment for excision had fully come. It is impossible to drive the suspicion from the mind that there are expressions in that letter which could not well bear the light of a Scottish sky, nor be read on the floor of a Free Assembly, previous to that debate. Accordingly, in the answer from our church, to this, at that time, hidden communication, allusions are again and again made, to things in the letter which cannot be defended; and to what these allusions allow to ouse out, farther reference shall be made. Here, then, is the committee doing a stronger thing than the writer wished to be done. He wished the Assembly to declare that it would not hear the American Church by deputation—the committee declares that it must not even be let speak, at the proper time, by letter : which was virtually to say—"O, ye Transatlantic associates of ours, be it known to you, that you look tolerably well when we speak for you, and personate you, but you would look intolerably ill if ye were permitted to speak for, and personate, yourselves."

Mr Macbeth takes up the contradiction between the plea that sufficient remonstrance had not been used with the sinning churches of America, and the fact that the remonstrance prepared a year before, had not found its way across the Atlantic. He says :—

Then glares out, to the astonishment of thousands, a fact for which it would seem not the caution of a committee, but the church itself is to blame. The plea for not as yet dropping fellowship is, that that must not be done—no nor even dreamed of, till remonstrance has been exhausted: there must first be sent out to America remonstrance after remonstrance. Well, what does the Free Church say to the fact, that the Assembly's deliverance of 1845 has never been sent to the American Church at all ; that a year and a half have been let slip without our lifting a voice in the matter ; that nothing has been done since 1844. A large amount of precious truth was contained in that deliverance of 1845 ; it was essentially a remonstrance, if not couched in the technical form of one ; alas! it never reached the parties whom it might have benefited.

Our author closes this head by the following emphatic sentence :—

To save that republic, its slavery must be abolished; and if it be not extricated by the energetic action of its churches—at present so shamefully lethargic—it will not be extricated peacefully, and the last lingering tints of the bow of hope on that western sky may soon disappear in a revolutionary storm—in a shower of blood. It is a great duty to press forward instantly these churches: to let a full year be lost, is an inexcusable neglect.

The next head embraces the subject of fellowship in cases where excision and remonstrance are required. He says :—

If it be admitted, then, that suspension, in a thoroughly proven case, comes, as to an individual, before remonstrance, it follows, that our whole procedure at present is out of joint, and in the very reverse order of the proper course. Let any pastor of a congregation state the case thus: a person, at present a member of your congregation, is caught on the Friday before the communion in the very act of theft; seen by hundreds; himself avowing it. Would you resolve to let him forward, meanwhile, on the Sabbath, but thereafter to begin a process of remonstrance with him.—(I do not say letting the case lie indolently over for two years.) Not at all. You would keep him back on the Sabbath, and thereafter deal with him, by interview, and loving, but strong remonstrance.

He returns to the all-important question in the case—Have not the American Churches had remonstrance? He says:—

In calmly considering whether the time has come to take this step of excision, we must insist on it, that account be taken of the many remonstrances with the American Church, from other bodies and individuals of eminence. The speakers in this debate seem resolved that all such remonstrances must go for nothing—that the only item to weigh with us, must be remonstrances by the Free Church. We cannot take this ground without throwing discredit on these other parties. Many things indeed have been said, as if the remonstrating parties were discreditable. The party of extreme abolitionists in America, the fierce attacks of the American agitators at present in Scotland, are pointed out in this debate, and almost exclusively referred to; and, judging especially from Dr Cunningham's speech, the reader would imagine that no respectable parties had remonstrated with the erring church. Nothing can leave a more inaccurate impression. Open your minds to the state of things. Let no passion guide you, nor passionate invective on either side. Look at facts. The Reformed Presbyterian Church is a friendly body, and their admirable remonstrance should be in every Free Church manse. No man in the Free Church will dare to tell you that this is "the clamour of a mob." Or what shall be said of the following deliverance, from the lips of James of Birmingham:—"We take negro slavery as it is, and we declare that to be a crime unfitting the individual that commits it, in this age, for Christian fellowship." Then bear in mind—in spite of whatever efforts put forth to make you overlook such facts—that as early as the year 1801, the American Reformed Presbyterian Church adopted, under the very eye of the American Presbyterian Church, the procedure contended for;—that in 1836, the United Associate Synod, the Relief Synod, the Congregational Union of Scotland, sent out remonstrances—in all of which all slaveholding is denounced as sinful;—while in 1844, the two largest churches in America, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Baptist Church, underwent each a disruption into two parts on this very question; events that were in themselves the strongest remonstrance to this sister church, the Presbyterian—a remonstrance pealed in her ears by epochs in providence, as if by a voice from God And then the principle of no Christian fellowship with slaveholders, has been received by the Congregational Union of England and Wales, and also of Scotland; by the Secession and by the Relief Synod; by the Wesleyan Conference of England; by the Baptist Union of London; by the Northern Baptist Association; by the Irish Southern Baptist Association; and by multitudes of local churches in England, of which forty are named. Is this mob-clamour—is this enmity or agitation against the Free Church?

Original Poetry.

SONNET ON AMERICAN SLAVERY.

There is a realm beneath the western sky,
Where liberty, with most unsparing hand,
Scatters unnumber'd blessings on the land;
Mingling with joyful notes that swell on high
In freedom's praise—thence comes the negro's cry
Loud wailing on the wind; he longs to stand
Unchained, as erst on Afric's burning sand;
Yet longs in vain, a bondsman he shall die;
So vows his Christian lord! whom lust of gain
Makes bold in crime, and quenches in his breast
All pity for the toil-worn negro's pain.
Ne'er let our pleading voice in silence rest,
Till tardy Justice, from the blood-stain'd shore,
Proclaims the negro is a slave no more.

W. G. M.

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURER KILLED.—An anti-slavery lecturer, named David Officer, was killed on the 5th ult. while lecturing in Shanesville, Tuscarawas county, Ohio, by David M. Mains. The latter was drunk, and had been put out of the meeting; he returned in a short time with a brickbat in his hand, and threw it with such violence at the head of Officer, that his skull was completely shattered. Officer survived but a short time.

The New Anti-Slavery League.

(From our own Reporter.)

On Monday evening last, a meeting was held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, by the Anti-Slavery League. The large room was crowded from an early hour of the evening by a highly respectable assembly, who nearly all remained to the close of the proceedings, which was near 12 o'clock. On the platform we observed Dr. Oxley; Rev. Dr. Carlile, of Hackney; Rev. Mr. Nelson, and other gentlemen from Belfast; Messrs. Garrison, Wright, and Douglass, from America; and Messrs. G. Thompson, Vincent, Parry, and many other leading friends of the anti-slavery cause.

On the motion of Mr. Parry, seconded by Mr. Vincent, George Thompson, Esq., was called to the chair.

The CHAIRMAN was received with warm applause. He first thanked them for placing him in that position, which he regarded as both important and honourable. He would not detain them by any lengthened observations of his own, but would merely state a few circumstances under which the present meeting had been called. A meeting was held some time ago in Glasgow, where among other important resolutions which were adopted, one was passed with regard to William Lloyd Garrison, the able and uncompromising abolitionist, who was most respectfully and urgently invited to come over to give the friends of the anti-slavery movement in this country the benefit of his experienced counsel, and to rouse up among them a feeling of more ardent regard to the cause of the oppressed slave. The invitation was sent over the water. The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society took the matter into consideration, and urged Mr. Garrison to come over to England. Ever ready to forward, at any cost, the interests of a cause which he had devoted many years of severe labour to, carry to a triumphant issue, at a great sacrifice to himself he had come over, and was now among them paying them another and a third visit. On his arrival in London he met a number of his friends under this roof. They spent some time in deliberation and arranging plans for their future proceedings. They then thought it would be better to hold a larger meeting and have present with them more of the friends of freedom. Accordingly, another meeting was called a week ago in this place, and at that time there was founded the Anti-Slavery League, and an opportunity was furnished to all anti-slavery friends to become members of it. He would now read the preamble of the constitution by which the movement of the newly-formed League would be conducted:—

"Whereas, there are in the United States of America 3,000,000 of the human race held in chains and slavery by a power which sacrilegiously usurps the proprietary right of the Creator; and whereas these 3,000,000 slaves, in their utter helplessness and degradation, make their appeal to the friends of humanity throughout the world; and whereas the cause of humanity is not bounded by country or clime, nor moral obligations and duties circumscribed by geographical limitations or governmental restrictions; and whereas the God of the oppressed, who hath never left himself without witness, hath raised up for the slave population of the United States friends who are nobly and faithfully struggling to obtain liberty for the captive by the prosecution of moral and peaceful measures:—

231

231

"Therefore we, the undersigned, desirous of showing our 'remembrance of those in bonds, as bound with them,' and believing that we can essentially serve the cause of those in bondage by acting with the uncompromising Abolitionists who compose the 'American Anti-Slavery Society,' do form ourselves into an Association to be called the 'Anti-Slavery League,' based upon the following principles :—

"Art. 1. That slave-holding is, under all circumstances, a sin of the deepest dye, and ought to be immediately abandoned.

"Art. 2. That the members of this League shall consist of all persons subscribing to the foregoing principles, without respect of country, complexion, or religious or political creeds.

"Art. 3. That the sole object of this League shall be the overthrow, by means exclusively moral and peaceful, of slavery in every land, but with special reference to the system now existing in the United States."

Such is the preamble of the constitution and object of the Anti-Slavery League formed here a few days ago. It is at present a small league, but not smaller than was another league at its commencement, and which had done its work. They would so far follow the plan of the Anti-Corn Law League, that they would popularize it and extend it over the country. They proposed to admit members to the League on the payment of 1s. It was thought a public meeting on a large scale should be held, that our American friends should have an opportunity of stating more at large their views of American slavery, and their views also of what should be done by the friends of freedom in the world to abolish the system which prevailed there. He had the honour of introducing to them several gentlemen who were well known as foremost advocates of abolition. The name of W. L. Garrison was a host of itself. (Loud cheers.) He was the man—emphatically *the* man—in the United States who first promulgated the doctrine of the entire and the immediate abolition of slavery. He would read them an extract from a newspaper which Mr. Garrison published in 1831, and for the publication of which views he had had to endure very severe sufferings. He then read the following passage from the first number of the *Liberator*, dated January 1, 1831, which paper continues to the present time, and whose motto is, "Our country is the world—our countrymen are mankind :"—

"I am aware that many will object to the severity of my language, but is there not cause for severity? I *will* be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write with moderation. No! no! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher! Tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen; but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present! I am in earnest. I will not equivocate; I will not excuse; I will not retreat a single inch. And I *will* be heard. The apathy of the people is enough to make every statue leap from its pedestal, and to hasten the resurrection of the dead."

Such was the boldness of Mr. Garrison, and such his resolute devotion to this cause, in 1831. And those who knew him as well as he (the chairman) knew him, knew how well he had redeemed his pledge. He has been maligned and persecuted, but steadily he has held on his way, and everywhere in his own country and in this, he is known as a

man above reproach. He might say much more, both of his character and his labours, if he (Mr. Garrison) were not present. He then passed a high eulogium on Mr. Wright. He must also say a word with regard to Frederick Douglass. He (Mr. Douglass) was here as the representative of the American slaves. He came from the very land, from the very people, where the atrocities they denounced were perpetrated. He could, then, say more on this subject than he (the chairman) could say. He would invite the aid of all in their cause. He would have their platform broad as the world—to contain men of every party and of every creed. They were engaged in the cause of humanity; he would, therefore, invite and welcome every friend of humanity to their platform and to their league. The chairman then read a resolution from the Boston Anti-Slavery Society of Coloured People, in reference to Mr. Garrison.

The Chairman then introduced, to move the first resolution,

James Haughton, Esq., of Dublin. He said, this motion being an introductory one, he should not make many remarks. He only hoped when American gentlemen came over here that they would be honest and true men. He said, we expect them to be abolitionists in reality. In order to gain full access to our hearts, and to participate fully of our hospitality, they must be men who do not apologise for slavery and who spare the slave holder; but they must be real and complete abolitionists. He was delighted to hear of the abolitionist ladies of America holding a bazaar. From what he had heard he believed the ladies of Boston were preparing for another bazaar, and he did hope that British ladies would assist the ladies of Boston in their noble works. He would not further detain the meeting, as he was no speaker, but he would try to make up for his want of eloquence by working, in his own neighbourhood and in his own way, for the prosperity of their cause. (Cheers.) He then moved—

"That we extend the right-hand of fellowship to William Lloyd Garrison, the undaunted and stedfast pioneer in the cause of universal emancipation; to Henry C. Wright, the unwearied advocate of the rights of humanity; and to Frederick Douglass, the self-emancipated bondman, and eloquent asserter of the claims of his brethren in chains; and do pledge ourselves to render all the aid in our power to these gentlemen, and their devoted coadjutors of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in the prosecution of their holy purposes for the extinction of American slavery."

Mr. Lovett seconded the motion. He said he would not detain them with any remarks of his own, but would just say, that he cordially concurred in the resolution.

The Rev. J. H. Hinton here rose, and said his name was too well known in connexion with the anti-slavery cause to have it supposed for a moment that he wished to throw any impediment in their way. Still he was not prepared to commit himself to the pledge contained in the resolution, and he wished not to be put to the painful necessity of holding up his hand against it. He only desired the chairman to say it was not carried unanimously; that would satisfy him.

The motion was then put and carried, Mr. Hinton and four others only holding up their hands against it.

Henry Clark Wright, from America, was then introduced by the chairman, as the firm, uncompromising friend of the slave. Mr. Wright was received with enthusiastic cheers. He then said,—Three millions of human beings in the United States of America are held under the following circumstances, *i.e.*, they are "chattels personal to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." This is the universal law of American slavery. Every slave is held and used as a beast or a thing; every slave holder holds and uses his fellow-beings as beasts and things. He cannot be a slave holder and not hold men in this condition. An American slave holder does not merely deprive men of political rights, he does not merely compel men to work without wages, and whip them if they refuse to toil that he may reap the fruits, but he claims and uses immortal man, made in the image of God, our brother, as a chattel, a brute, a thing; he not only robs his victim of domestic, social, and political rights, and of his earnings, but of his personal ownership, his body and soul, and buys and sells them in the market as he would a horse or a sheep. This is an American slave; and this an American slave holder. No matter what his title, rank, or character in other respects, every slave-holding minister, elder, deacon, and church member, turns man into a brute, a thing, and holds and uses him as such. Will you tell me that God made one man to be the property of another? Never! (Applause.) Every man who enslaves his brother practically denies the being of a God and the brotherhood of man. He is and must of necessity be to "all intents, construction, and purposes, whatsoever, a villain." (Great applause.) And if we, our wives or our children, were held as chattels, herded with beasts, and bought and sold, no possible arguments could convince us that those who inflicted these wrongs upon us were not consummate villains. If any act is villainy, slave holding is; if there are villains on earth all slave holders are and must be such. (Approbation, and cries of "Yes, yes.") But what follows as the necessary fruit of this application of the chattel principle to man? Three millions of the people of the United States—men and women—are denied marriage, and are compelled to herd together as brute beasts in a state of concubinage; the universal law of mankind that says children shall follow the condition of the father, is reversed, and the slave child must follow the condition of the mother; a slave's father is never recognized or asked for, in ecclesiastical or civil courts; it would make a fearful exposure of all slave holders and their sons if it were so; the slave parent has no more control over the child than the sheep over the lamb; cannot choose for the child an occupation nor instruct him in the knowledge of letters or the word of his God—stripes, imprisonment, or death would be his doom if he did; the slave cannot bear witness against a white man in civil or ecclesiastical courts, or be a party to a suite. The sole end of the slave's existence is the profit of his master; and he is reared, disciplined, baptized, brought into the church, and taught that there is a God, a Saviour, an eternity, and a judgment to come, solely to enhance his price in the market, and to add to the master's gains. Such is the present actual condition of every American slave, by whomsoever and from whatsoever motive held. Such are the wrongs inflicted on three millions of our fellow-men in the United States—a nation professing to be the most civilized, and Christianized, and freest people on earth. Such is the present condition of one-sixth of the population in that land of schools, colleges, bibles, churches, and priests, and with a Government

based upon the principle that "all men are created free and equal;" and that it is a "self-evident truth that each and every human being has an inalienable right to liberty." Who inflicts these wrongs upon those slaves? Who turns these men and women into beasts? Who buys and sells Christ, in his little ones, at auction? Who abrogates marriage, and compels men and women to live in concubinage? Who scourge, imprison, and slaughter men for teaching their children to read the "blessed gospel of the Son of God?" Who breed and rear human beings for the market, as the farmers of England do cattle? The slave laws? The slave system? The institution? No. Laws are nothing; systems and institutions are nothing, without the men who frame and administer them. Whatever the slave laws do, or the slave system, every slave holder does, and whatever injustice or infamy belong to the system of slavery belong to each and every slave holder. (Loud cheers.) Slave-holding is an act, not a law, system, or institution; it is a crime, for which every individual man and woman who commits it is responsible. (Applause.) Can laws breed and rear human beings for the market? No. Can a system wield the lash and clank the fetter? No. Can an institution tear asunder husbands and wives, parents and children, and crush all the sweetest affections of human existence? No. Can an abstraction or an intangible nonentity, called a "peculiar domestic institution," perpetrate the theft, robbery, adultery, incest, pollution, and murder, inherent in and inseparable from American slavery? No, no; these deeds are done by the slave holders and their apologists. (Great and continued applause.) Especially are these crimes perpetrated by the slave-holding ministers and churches of America and their apologists. (Cheers.) These above all others are most guilty, for they sanctify them, and seek to give to all these crimes and pollutions an air of respectability, and the sanction of a just and impartial God. (Great sensation.) Do you say that my language is severe, violent, and denunciatory? I simply call a thief, a thief; a robber, a robber. Blot all words of opprobrium from the language, or apply them to those to whom they are most applicable. He that steals a hat, or a coat, you call a thief. What will you call him who steals hat and coat, and body and soul? An honest man? A Christian? (Loud applause.) You consign the man who steals your horse, or robs your sheepfold, to a felon's dungeon. Will you seat him at your dinner or your communion table who steals your wife, and robs your nursery and cradle of their priceless contents? You arraign the man who plunders your ships before your criminal courts, and elevate him to a gallows. Will you call the slave breeder and slave trader before your ecclesiastical courts, and elevate him to your pulpits and to the honours of a doctor of divinity? (Renewed and loud applause.) In 1794 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America adopted, as a part of their discipline, that "all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery or retaining them in it, all who keep, sell, or buy slaves, are man stealers—guilty of the highest kind of theft, and sinners of the first rank." These man stealers have so increased in that church, that in 1816 that testimony against slave holders was blotted out. Before me are the resolutions of the New School General Assembly adopted last spring. That assembly was composed in part of man stealers. I have the debates in that body on slavery. More atrocious sentiments were

never uttered. There was an assembly, composed in part of men "guilty of the highest kind of theft, and sinners of the first rank," met to concoct measures to spread the kingdom of truth and love. Who was moderator? Rev. Samuel H. Cox., D.D. There he sat as moderator of an assembly which, according to their own book of discipline, in 1794 was a "brotherhood of thieves." He heard slave breeders and slave drivers utter their blasphemies without rebuke. Dr. Cox was anxious to have that "brotherhood" appoint him and Doctors Patten and Skinner delegates to the Evangelical Alliance Convention now met in this city. The assembly objected to grant his request, because slave holders would not be allowed seats in that convention. Dr. Cox was told "that he would very likely be turned out himself for fellowshipping slave-holders. He told them in return, that he had it from gentlemen of responsibility in London and elsewhere, that the resolution keeping out slave holders had been attenuated down to mere nothing, and would offer no real impediment to the entrance of any one who was not a notorious slave holder; that it was done merely to gratify John Bull in one of his whims. Dr. Cox told the assembly that their honour would be perfectly safe in his keeping, for every man that went to Europe had a sudden fit of patriotism after he got there, and if the Alliance Convention did anything that would insult the dignity of the Presbyterian Church, they might depend upon it that he and his colleagues would instantly leave the body, shaking off the dust of his feet against them. * * * After the business of the assembly was concluded, the slave holders got up a resolution of thanks to Dr. Cox, for the impartial and satisfactory manner in which he had presided at their meetings; upon which the anti-slavery apostate put his white handkerchief to his eyes, and appeared to be much affected. They then sung, 'Blest be the tie that binds,' &c., and, after a prayer by the moderator, separated."—(Extracted from a letter written by one who was present at the scene.) Dr. Cox is now a member of the Alliance Convention, helping to diffuse his slave-holding religion in that body. The Rev. Dr. Patten, of New York, is also now in this city to aid the deliberations of the Evangelical Alliance. Before me is a letter from the Rev. W. Page, who was employed to fill Dr. Patten's pulpit while he was absent. It is well known that the coloured people of America are objects of scorn and abuse because of their colour. They are proscribed from the social circle and the church; and Doctors Cox, Patten, Skinner, Kirke, and Olin, would not admit my friend, Frederick Douglass, to their dinner table in America as they do whites. We have the negro or "Jim Crow" pew, as it is called, in the churches there, of all leading denominations, except the Catholics. The editor of the *American Anti-Slavery Standard*, knowing that Dr. Patten had come to join the Alliance, gave notice to that body of the state of things in his church. Rev. W. Page, Dr. Patten's substitute for the time being, answered the editor; and in that answer admits that the "Jim Crow" is in his church, and declares that pew to be the seat of honour. The rev. gentleman expatiates in the following language on the dignity and advantages of the negro pew:—

"As to what is said about the 'Jim Crow pew,' in Dr. Patten's church, I will remark, that there are quite a number of them there, and very commodious ones too—situated not in the lowest room, but near the head of the table, close by the master of the ceremonies. Indeed they are placed, conspicuous,

right over the heads of the white worshippers underneath them—higher up a little towards Heaven than even the pulpit itself, at Dr. Patten's right hand, and near his heart, I have no doubt. They are seated just as the Son of God himself is seated (great sensation)—viz., on high, above the great congregation, in the eye of all, and by the right hand of his best friend. Who will scorn the position? Who will call it the Jim Crow pew of Jesus Christ? (Disapprobation and disgust.) And when the communion Sabbath came, I saw no other 'respectful distance' maintained between the coloured and white people, than that one sat in one pew and the other in the next."

Did priestly hardihood ever utter such impiety before! But the reverend blasphemer uttered a terrible truth. Dr. Patten's negro pew and its scorned and despised occupants are nearer Heaven than Dr. Patten's pulpit and its reverend occupant; and if Jesus Christ were to enter that synagogue of Satan (for all churches that can keep the negro pew are such), he would enter the Jim Crow pew and sit with the victims of American prejudice against colour, rather than enter the pulpit to sit beside that negro-hater, the Rev. Dr. Patten. Yet this man, who can preach in a church that thus scorns and proscribes human beings because they are black, and never rebukes this unnatural and wicked prejudice, is welcomed to a World's Temperance Convention and to the Evangelical Alliance! People of England, tell these men to go home, and cease to persecute our coloured brethren, and thus to sustain slave holders in all their guilt; tell them to go home, and cease to proscribe men from the church, the social circle, the car, the steamboat, the shop, the school, and college, because of their colour; tell them to repent and make restitution to the coloured man for the wrongs they do him; let them feel your scorn and indignation, while they persevere in this wicked prejudice. The following is a specimen of the slave-holding religion which is represented by these pro-slavery delegates in the Evangelical Alliance. I quote from a volume of *Sermons*, published by Bishop Meade, of Virginia, for masters and slaves. The bishop tells the slaves—

"Almighty God hath been pleased to make you slaves here, and to give you nothing but labour and poverty in this world, which you are obliged to submit to, as it is His will that it should be so. . . Take care that you do not fret or murmur, grumble or repine, at your condition, for this will not only make your life uneasy, but will greatly offend Almighty God. . . . . Now, when *correction* is given you, you either deserve it or you do not deserve it. But whether you really deserve it or not it is your duty, and Almighty God requires that you bear it patiently. You may, perhaps, think that this is hard doctrine, but if you consider it right you must needs think otherwise of it. Suppose, then, that you deserve correction, you cannot but say that it is just and right you should meet with it. Suppose you do not, or at least you do not deserve so much or so severe a correction for the fault you have committed, you perhaps have escaped a great many more, and are at last paid for all. Or, suppose you are quite innocent of the crime laid to your charge, and suffer wrongfully in that particular thing, is it not possible you may have done some other bad thing which was never discovered, and that Almighty God, who saw you doing it, would not let you escape

without punishment one time or another? And ought you not in such a case to give glory to Him, and be thankful that He would rather punish you in this life for your wickedness, than destroy your souls for it in the next life? But, suppose that even this was not the case (a case hardly to be imagined), and that you have by no means, known or unknown, deserved the correction you suffered, there is this great comfort in it, that if you bear it patiently, and leave your cause in the hands of God, He will reward you for it in Heaven, and the punishment you suffer unjustly here, shall turn to your exceeding great glory hereafter." (Expressions of horror.)

I take the following from a work entitled "*Slavery and the Slave-holder's Religion as opposed to Christianity*, by Samuel Brooks, Cincinnati, Ohio; published in 1846." It is a true specimen of the religion represented by Messrs. Cox, Patten, Skinner, and Olin. "The person in Oberlin, Ohio, to whom the following letter was addressed, has liberated 150 slaves, and prefers enduring honest poverty to revelling in ill-gotten gains.—Slaveholding Christianity, to the Life.—It may strike some minds that the following letter must be a burlesque. For the sake of such it may be important to say that its genuineness is beyond question. The individual to whom the letter was addressed is here, is well known, and is himself well acquainted with the writer. We have all the names in full; but suppose it better to give the public only the initials. The letter may therefore be read as a veritable portraiture of at least one of the forms of a slave-holding Christianity.—*Oberlin Evangelist.*

"B——, Georgia, September 4, 1845.

"Dear Sir,—I take up my pen to write to you once more, though it is not I that write, but the Lord that writeth through me. Permit me to inform you that since I wrote to you last, I have come out and embraced the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and am now living in the glorious light and liberty of the children of God. We have had quite an interesting church meeting here this week in relation to Deacon H———. It was thought by many that he would be disfellowshipped, but finally his case was set forth in such a vivid light by the influential members of the church, our pastor among the rest, that he was honourably discharged. For fear that you will think the case worse than it really is, I will just state the facts (although you are such an abolitionist, I suppose you will think it bad enough as it is). The deacon had an old slave, that had been in the habit of running away, but had always been caught, until finally about two weeks ago, he made another attempt. No sooner was the old thing missing, than cousin H—— borrowed neighbour P——'s hounds and started in search of him. He had not proceeded far in the woods before he found the old man perched upon the limb of a large tree. He ordered him several times to come down, but the old man, who was as stubborn as an ass, still maintained his position. The deacon then, becoming excited, fired his gun at him. The ball passed through his ankle, and mangled it in such a manner that it mortified and he died. But as I have before stated, our good pastor (may the Lord bless his soul), held forth for the justification of the deacon in such a vivid and heaven-approving style, that he was discharged upon the ground that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own property,—a judgment which would have been passed by any righteous man. Your uncle J—— buried his youngest child last week. Your cousin W—— thought of studying at Oberlin, but it is such an abolition hole, I do not think his father will let

him go. I have partly bargained for about 50 slaves belonging to Mr. ———. If I can get them as cheap as I expect to, I shall make profit on them, for I understand that the Orleans market is quite good now. I expect to send them down as soon as my driver recovers: for in flogging one of my old slaves the other day, he received a very severe wound from him, he having struck him with his hoe, whereupon the driver instantly drew his pistol from his pocket and shot him dead upon the spot—a fate which he justly merited. From his extreme age (being nearly 80 years old) I consider his death a gain and not a loss to me.

"In your last you spoke of visiting us next year. If you come I pray you to leave your abolitionism behind, and show yourself a man. It is now time to go to prayer meeting, and I must close. My wife joins me in love to you.

"Yours, "J. F. F."

[The reading of the above extract was frequently interrupted by expressions of indignation.]

The following revolting illustration of the same slave-holding religion is taken from the *Congregational Journal*, an American paper:—

"We have rarely met with a more revolting instance of inhumanity and hypocrisy, than the one recently related at a public meeting at Cincinnati, by the Rev. Mr. Boucher, a methodist minister, who formerly resided at the south. While he was on the Alabama circuit, he spent a Sabbath with an old circuit preacher, who was also a doctor, living near the 'Horseshoe,' celebrated as General Jackson's battle ground. Early one morning he was reading Pope's Messiah to Mr. Boucher, when his wife called him out. Mr. Boucher glanced his eye out of the window, and saw a slave man standing by, and the husband and wife consulting over him. Presently the doctor took a raw hide from under his coat, and began to cut up the half-naked back of the slave. Several inches of the skin turned up, perfectly white, at every stroke, until the whole back was red with gore. At first the lacerated man cried out in his agony; at which the doctor and divine cried out at every stroke, 'Won't ye hush? won't ye hush?' till finally the slave stood still, and bore his tortures with only a groan. As soon as he had completed his task, the doctor came in, panting and almost out of breath, and addressing Mr. Boucher, said, 'Won't you go to prayers with us, sir?' The amazed circuit rider fell upon his knees and prayed, uttering he hardly knew what. When he left the house, the poor creature of a slave had crept up and knelt at the door during prayer, with his body all gore down to his very heels."

Such is the slave-holding religion as represented by the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, and Congregational Churches of America. Thank God, it has no more affinity to Christianity than heathenism or cannibalism. To such a religion we must all be infidels in order to be Christians. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) Mr. Wright closed by offering the following resolution:—

"That we regard with feelings of profound sorrow and humiliation the state of the American churches in relation to the question of slavery, and would earnestly implore the various religious denominations of this country to discharge, in all Christian fidelity, the duty of admonishing those professing Christians in America who practice or in any wise plead for the existence of the foul abomination in their midst; which reduces the image of God to the condition of a chattel and a brute, and condemns to ignorance and perpetual bondage those for whom Christ died."

Mr. Garrison was then introduced to the meeting. He was received with enthusiastic cheering, hundreds rising from their seats. He wished to know if they were in earnest when they gave him that reception? Were they disposed to regard him as the friend of universal liberty? Then he begged to tell them, that if they went over to America they would be deemed fit subjects for Lynch law. (Laughter and cheers.) What! were they in earnest? were there no apologists for slavery there? none to applaud those ancient slave-holding patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jocob? none to talk of sending Onesimus back to his master because he was a slave? Were there none to apologize for those pious men who plundered cradles of babes, tortured women by the slave-driver's lash, and sent men to the auction block? "Why then" said Mr. Garrison, "here's my hand for every one of you, and here's a heart that beats in unison with your own. (Great cheering.) If in all my toils and suffering which I have met in this cause I had not been firm and unflinching, if I did not feel assured that though the masters have been and still are against me, that the slaves are with me, and that the free coloured population of America are pouring out their blessings on me, your presence would be the last place where I should wish to stand. I feel a little lifted up when I know that my exertions are making the slaveholder uneasy and uncomfortable;—a price is at this hour set on my poor head. The State of Georgia has offered a reward of 5,000 dollars for my head, and the legislature of the United States has sanctioned this decision. (Shouts of disapprobation.) But despite that decision I will exert myself until slavery be abolished, or until our boast is abolished that God has made all men equal and free. (Loud cheering.) When I came over in 1838, that distinguished opponent of slavery Thomas Fowell Buxton sent me an invitation to take breakfast with him. He also invited Dr. Lushington and many other friends of the slave, stating in his note of invitation, that a coloured gentleman, from Boston, would breakfast with him. I have indeed tried to be a coloured man in all my struggles in this cause, having identified my interests with those of the coloured people. (Cheers.) But we have no distinction of colour now with us. We have bleached out all the colour from our slaves. In our plantations are persons of white complexions and with the straightest hair. When the slaves run away they are advertized as so very white that they will pass for white people unless they are closely watched. We have bleached out all the colour of those who come from Africa, and, in the course of a few years, there will hardly be a coloured man in America. I need not tell you what those means of pollution are. Yet those who are steeped in that pollution, who raise and breed children for the market, generally are those who talk to the abolitionists against amalgamation, meaning a virtuous marriage between a white and a coloured person. Sir, slavery is a power so great and so mighty, that few individuals in our country dare to confront the monster; and even the boldest are even sometimes afraid. It is no common conflict in which we are engaged, because whatever forms of political oppression you may have here, or in Europe, or in the world besides, there is no power so dreadful and so exterminating, as American slavery; it began with the very beginning of the Union (hear), and it has grown with our growth, until it now holds complete mastery over the whole country, so that the two great political parties are eager to do its bidding; and religious sects bow before it and do it homage: in one word, it has completely subjected church and state. Above

all, we are against church and state, because it is on the side of slavery; we say that it is the support of slavery, and they shall go down together. (Great applause.) It is said that the Abolitionists are assailing the American church; it is true. It is said they are assailing the American clergy in a body; it is true. It is said that they are assailing the Government under which they live; it is true. It is said that they are seeking the dissolution of the union; it is true. Why do I say this? Because the church is the stronghold of the system; because the clergy are active defenders of the system; because the Government is organically so constructed that it gives its entire support to slavery, so long as the slave holder shall desire it. Now, to come to facts, and to show you that I do not exaggerate in what I state, I will read for you a few extracts, giving you the very words of the abettors of slavery in the church. The Rev. T. S. Witherspoon, of Alabama, writes to the editor of the *Emancipator*:—

"When the tardy process of the law is too long in redressing our grievances, we of the south have adopted the summary remedy of Judge Lynch—and really I think it one of the most wholesome and salutary remedies for the malady of northern fanaticism that can be applied, and no doubt my worthy friend, the editor of the *Emancipator and Human Rights*, would feel the better of its enforcement, provided he had a southern administrator. I go to the Bible for my warrant in all moral matters. * * * Let your emissaries dare venture to cross the Potomac, and I cannot promise you that their fate will be less than Haman's. Then beware how you goad an insulted but magnanimous people to deeds of desperation."

The Rev. William S. Plummer, D.D., Virginia, writes (to the chairman of a committee of correspondence, appointed by the citizens of Richmond to oppose the progress of anti-slavery principles at the south):—

"I have carefully watched this matter from its earliest existence, and everything I have seen and heard of its character, both from its patrons and its enemies, has confirmed me, beyond repentance, in the belief that, let the character of abolitionists be what it may in the sight of the Judge of all the earth, this is the most meddlesome, imprudent, reckless, fiercest, and wicked excitement I ever saw. I am willing at any time that the world should know that such are my views. A few things are perfectly clear to my mind:—

"1. The more speedy, united, firm, and solemnly resolute but temperate, the expression of public opinion on this subject in the whole south, the better it will be for the north for slave holders, and generally for the slaves.

"2. If abolitionists will set the country in a blaze, it is but fair that they should have the first warming at the fire. * * *

"Lastly, abolitionists are, like infidels, wholly unaddicted to martyrdom for opinion's sake. Let them understand that they will be caught, if they come among us, and they will take good heed to keep out of our way. There is not one man among them who has any more idea of shedding his blood in this cause than he has of making war on the Grand Turk. Their universal spirit is to stand off and growl and bark at men and institutions, without daring to march for one moment into their midst, and attack them with apostolic fearlessness.

"With sentiments of great respect, I remain yours, &c., "W. S. PLUMMER."

(Shame, shame.) Englishmen, that is the liberty we enjoy in republican America. They give men Lynch law, and burn men at the stake in the south.

No man can go from the north to the south with a scrap of abolitionist paper with him, but he would be in danger of his liberty or of his life. The *New Orleans True American* says—

"We can assure the Bostonians, one and all, who have embarked in the nefarious scheme of abolishing slavery at the south, that lashes will hereafter be spared the backs of their emissaries. Let them send out their men to Louisiana; they will never return to tell their suffering, but they shall expiate the crime of interfering in our domestic institutions by being burned at the stake."

In the *Charleston Courier*, of August 11, 1835, it is written:—

"Let us declare, through the public journals of our country, that the question of slavery is not, and shall not, be open to discussion; that the system is too deep-rooted among us, and must remain for ever; that the very moment any private individual attempts to lecture us upon its evils and immorality, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out and cast upon the dunghill."

The following letter, which appears in the *Oberlin Evangelist*, will show how religion and go together, though there is something which shocks one's feelings, in finding religion mixed up with such wickedness:—

"Georgia, Sept. 4, 1845.

"Dear Sir,—I take up my pen to write to you once more, though it is not I that write, but the Lord that writeth through me. Permit me to inform you that since I wrote to you last, I have come out and embraced the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and am now living in the glorious light and liberty of the children of God. We have had quite an interesting church meeting here this week in relation to Deacon H——. It was thought by many that he would be disfellowshiped, but finally his case was set forth in such a vivid light by the influential members of the church, our pastor among the rest, he was honourably discharged. For fear you will think the case worse than it really is, I will just state the facts (although you are such an abolitionist, I suppose you will think it bad enough as it is). The deacon had an old slave, that had been in the habit of running away, but had always been caught, until finally about two weeks ago, he made another attempt. No sooner was the old thing missing, than cousin H—— borrowed neighbour P——'s hounds, and started in search of him. He had not proceeded far in the woods before he found the old man perched upon the limb of a large tree. He ordered him several times to come down, but the old man, who was as stubborn as an ass, still maintained his position. The deacon then becoming excited, fired his gun at him. The ball passed through his ankle, and mangled it in such a manner that it mortified, and he died. But as I have before stated, our good pastor (may the Lord bless his soul) held forth for the justification of the deacon in such a vivid and heaven approving style, that he was discharged upon the ground that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own property—a judgment which would have been passed by any righteous man. Your uncle J—— buried his youngest child last week. Your cousin W—— thought sometime of studying at Oberlin, but it is such an abolition hole, I do not think his father will let him go. I have partly bargained for about 50 slaves belonging to Mr.——. If I can get them as cheap as I expect to, I shall make profit on them, for I understand that the Orleans market is quite good

now. I expect to send them down as soon as my driver recovers; for in flogging one of my old slaves the other day, he received a very severe wound from him, he having struck him with his hoe, whereupon the driver instantly drew his pistol from his pocket and shot him dead upon the spot, a fate which he justly merited. From his extreme age (being nearly 80 years old) I consider his death a gain and not a loss to me.

"In your last you spoke of visiting us next year. If you come, I pray you to leave your abolitionism behind, and show yourself a man. It is now time to prayer meeting, and I must close. My wife joins me in love to you.

"Yours, "J. F. F."

(Strong expressions of disapprobation.) Hail! Columbia, happy land. Such, you see, are some of the difficulties which beset us in our own country in advancing this cause. The slaveholders, and apologists for slavery, cannot bear the light. "'Tis conscience makes cowards of us all." (Cheers.) How different it is here. The moment a man speaks of liberty here, his voice is drowned in your cheers. I have been so accustomed to face a storm, that really your sunshine almost melts me down. I state to you nothing but facts. If what I say be not true—if any man can prove that what we say is not true—let him do it. (Cheers.) But if we speak nothing but the truth, then you must regard all Americans who say contrary things to what we say, as the worst of hypocrites, and liars of the first kind. But I have not come to England to defame the land of my nativity; it is as dear to my heart as it ought to be, or can possibly be. I have not come here to speak against republicanism (hear, hear, and cheers)—I have not come here to depreciate Christianity, as taught by Jesus Christ, but to vindicate it (cheers)—therefore I must tell the truth, for it is truth only that saves. I want to bring not destruction, but salvation to my country. (Hear, hear.) It is not only that we profess to be Christians, but we endeavour to turn Christianity to very good account in dollars and cents. (Laughter) We, with our Christianity, are worse than Mahomedans. The Mahomedans have a law that no man shall enslave his brother. When they take a man captive in war, they invite his belief in Mahomet, and if he profess belief in him, the man is admitted into the brotherhood of the faith. But in our country—our Christian land—when a man is born again it does not hasten his emancipation. It increases his value. A Christian slave is worth more dollars. He is proclaimed at the auction stand by the auctioneer as a Christian, and it is mentioned as a reason why he should fetch more money. I will read you the opinions of some slaveholders, to show that they attach importance to religion as a means of quietude and improvement of their slaves:—Thomas Cook writes from Marlborough district, May, 1845:—

"Plantations under religious instruction are more easily governed than those that are not."

John Dyson writes from Sumpter district, May, 1845:—

"Upon the discipline and subordination of plantations, religious instruction will be found generally and decidedly beneficial."

William Curtis writes from Richland district, May, 1845:—

"I have found the owners of plantations around not only willing but desirous that we should preach to their negroes; and they find, as they expect, a better spirit and subordination among them."

James Gillam writes from Abbeville district, May, 1845:—

"The deeper the piety of the slave the more valuable is he in every sense of the word."

Nicholas Ware writes from Brownsville, Marlborough district, May, 1845 :—

"All our negroes have, to a great extent, grown up under religious instruction. * * We scarcely hear of depredations upon stock, &c. They are more obedient and more to be depended on. We have few or no runaways, and corporeal punishment is but seldom resorted to."

N. R. Middleton writes from St. Andrew's parish, May, 1845 :—

"A regard to self interest should lead every planter to give his people religious instruction."

John Rivers writes from Colleton district, May, 1845 :—

"Religious instruction promotes the discipline and subordination on plantations."

It is in this form religion is taught to slaves, and thus is their manhood taken from them, and their freedom. Thus these wolves in sheep's clothing distort God's Gospel. You must not, therefore, call America a Christian nation or a Republican nation, but you must call it a bloodhound nation. I will read for you some advertisements common in the south, and other extracts, which will prove what I have said :—

"MINISTERS HOUNDS, AND RUNAWAY NEGROES.

"The Home Missionary of the Alabama Association, writing to the Alabama Baptist on the subject of ministerial support, attributes the unwillingness of the people to support their preachers, in part to the teaching of the anti-missionary ministers. And he represents one of these riding through the country with a train of about 20 hounds and with a brace of pistols, and a bowie knife projecting out of his pocket, showing a handle which would make a bludgeon, as his informant told him, 'large enough to kill the d——l,' and thus fully armed and equipped, he makes his excursions, hunting runaway negroes."

The Missionary of the Alabama Association goes on to say :—

"While it may be right and proper that some one should keep such dogs, and follow such avocation, we think it does not fitly become the ambassadors of Christ. Let the churches then awake to the subject of ministerial support."

A late number of the *Sumter Co. Whig*, published at Livingston, Alabama, contains the following atrocious advertisement—proving what is notoriously true, that it is a regular business at the south to train dogs to catch negroes, and to let them out by the day or job, to hunt the poor runaways in the swamps and forests! The advertisement is copied precisely as it appears in the *Whig* :—

"NEGRO DOGS.

"The undersigned having bought the entire pack of negro dogs (of the Hays' and Allen stock), he now proposes to catch runaway negroes. His charge will be three dollars per day for hunting, and 15 dollars for catching a runaway. He resides 3½ miles north of Livingston, near the lower Jones' Bluff-road.

"Nov. 6, 1845. "WILLIAM GAMBREL."

O! friends, what a horrible state of society is this! (Strong disgust manifested by the audience.) And yet I never knew a minister of the Gospel, nor a church take a step in averting the evil. Breathes there a man created in God's image, and for whom Christ has died, who ought to be treated so? (Cries of "No, no.") And why not? Why, because men, all men, are equal. Mr. Garrison then read extracts, to show that the American Government had

sanctioned the employment of dogs in catching runaway negroes. For the negro runs away from his white Christian master, if he can, even to the red Indians in the woods. I will read you the words of our judges and courts, which authorize the killing of slaves :—

"That a proclamation of outlawry against a slave is authorized whenever he runs away from his master, conceals himself in some obscure retreat, and, to sustain life, kills a hog, or some animal of the cattle kind."—See *Haywood's Manual*, 521 ; act of 1741, c. 24, s. 45.

"State of North Carolina, Lenoir County.

"Whereas complaint hath been this day made to us, two of the justices of the peace for the said county, by William D. Cobb, of Jones county, that two negro slaves belonging to him—one named Ben, commonly known by the name of Ben Fox and Rigdon, have absented themselvesfrom their said master's services, and are lurking about in the counties of Lenoir and Jones committing acts of felony;—these are in the name of the state, to command the said slaves forthwith to surrender themselves, and turn home to their said master. And we do hereby also require the sheriff of the said county of Lenoir to make diligent search and pursuit after the above-mentioned slaves ; and them having found, to apprehend and secure, so that they may be conveyed to their said master, or otherwise discharged, as the law districts. And the said sheriff is hereby empowered to raise and take with him such power of his county as he shall think fit for the apprehension of said slaves. And we do hereby, by virtue of an act of Assembly of this states, concerning servants and slaves, intimate and declare, if the said slaves do not surrender themselves, and return home to their masters immediately after the publication of these presents, that any person may kill or destroy said slaves by such means as he or they think fit, without accusation or impeachment of any crime or offence for so doing, or without incurring any penalty or forfeiture thereby.

"Given under our hands and seals, this 12th of November, 1836. "B. Coleman, J. P.
"J. Jones, J. P."

"TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

"Runaway from the subscriber, about three years ago, a certain negro man named Ben, commonly known by the name of Ben Fox ; also one other negro, by the name of Rigdon, who ran away on the 8th of this month.

"I will give the reward of 100 dollars for each of the above negroes to be delivered to me, or confined in the gaol of Lenoir or Jones county, or for the *killing* of them so that I can see them.

"Nov. 12, 1836. "W. D. Cobb."

The *Wilmington Advertiser* (North Carolina), of July 13, 1838, contains the following advertisement :—

"Runaway, my negro man Richard. A reward of 25 dollars will be paid for his apprehension, *dead* or *alive*. Satisfactory proof will only be required of his being killed. He has with him, in all probability, his wife Eliza, who ran away from Colonel Thompson, now a resident of Alabama, about the time he commenced his journey to that state.

"D. H. Rhodes."

Such is slavery in America! And yet the abolitionists are stigmatized as infidels, beeause they would have no such Christianity or republicanism as sunctioned such atrocities. Slavery is a curse wherever it is found. It not only smites with barrenness the most fertile soil in the world, but it makes

human life cheap, and in fact, of no value at all. (Cheers.) A year ago I thought I would collect from the newspapers all the horrible details of killing, maiming, &c., connected with slavery, and put them in my paper. My collection was imperfect, for I had no southern papers, for they will not send papers to me from the south. I took the northern papers, and took out of them the most bloody deeds. They are very few indeed, but they show the state of society there, and a state of insecurity for human life such as can nowhere else be found. The list was begun a year ago, and this paper is full of short paragraphs. (Here Mr. Garrison unrolled a paper, the width of one of our columns, made up of short accounts of murders, &c., and unrolled it from end to end. It was above 12 yards long. There were calls for a few to be read; Mr. Garrison then read two or three and then continued.) And yet there are those who attempt to excuse this state of things. I am sorry that there are Englishmen disposed to apologize for those American Christians who keep blood hounds! They say, they are under a great mistake —they are in error, but you must call such Christians no hard or bad names. But I say the American people are excluded from apology. They hold the declaration in their hand that all men are equal; then they enslave their brother, and whip him, and hunt him with bloodhounds, and profess the gospel of Christ. Now, no man can be excused for enslaving another, whether he be savage or civilized. (Great applause.) God has put a witness in every man's breast which protests against man holding a man in bondage. I never debate the question as to whether man may hold property in man. I never degraded myself by debating the question, "Is slavery a sin?" It is a self evident truth, which God has engraven on our very nature. Where I see the holder of a slave, I charge the sin upon him, and I denounce him. It was once said it would be dangerous to free the states at once. The slaves will rebel and cut their masters' throats. (Laughter.) These fears were all vain. But if not, let us do what is right. God has declared, if thou undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free. And yet after all our guilt, we do not repent. We Americans are cursing you British people in our hearts! We have a controversy with you, because you are not slave holders. Are we not Democrats? Do we not make all the thrones of Europe tremble? Does not Nicholas tremble at the glorious example which we have set? We are hard to be pleased in America. We sometimes taunt you Englishmen with having set us a bad example. So Americans say to excuse their own blood-guiltings. (Cheers.) For surely you could not force us to be slave holders! You could not force the tea on us! (Immense applause.) You said you would supply our market with tea, but we resisted you, and overcame you. But you have washed your hands of this traffic, and for this we hate you! Slaves are in America, in whom the love of freedom cannot be suppressed. They struggle and pant for freedom. They ford rivers, and morasses; they climb hills and mountains; they know they are in danger of being shot down and hunted down by dogs, but yet they brave the danger. The slave has escaped, he has no friend with him, but there is the north star which God has set in Heaven, and the fugitive panting for freedom, has heard that star will conduct him to an asylum called Canada, where the British flag waves, to give him shelter. (Rapturous applause.) 1,500 are already safely landed on the shores of freedom. I stand here as the representative of the American Anti-slavery

Society. We begun our movement by laying a broad foundation. We united men of all ranks. We knew not whither the principle would lead us. We believed the principle was divine. Whatever then called for a sacrifice of the principle, we said, it must be taken out of the way. There were obstacles in the way. But God said, "Pluck out the right eye, cut off the right hand." We found the political party sanctioning slavery. We found religious bodies heeding no cries of the friends of the slave. Now, we had either to denounce these bodies, or to give up the cause. And some did give up the cause. They said, "the church is pro-slavery, and therefore guilty, but it is still the Church of Christ," and so they went and joined the enemy. These men have invented watch-words by which we should be known and hated wherever known. For they have gone all over the land. (Cries of "Shame, shame.") The Anti-slavery Society has been true to its principles,—true as the needle to the pole. Some wishing to injure our cause, would tell you that we affirm the Sabbath to be not divine, that we are anti-ministry and anti-church men. Those who say so, there is not one word of thuth in them. The anti-slavery cause has never discussed the questions of the ministery, the Sabbath, or the church. And how do you judge of their conduct if not by what they say? The friends of this movement have a right to their individual opinions on other points, but do not judge to condemn this cause because of the opinions of individual members of it. We have made ministers and members of a pro-slavery church uneasy, because we have denounced slavery, wherever it has been found. Our crime has been that we have unmasked the wolves in sheep's clothing. And because we won't gratify this minister or that member, they have gone away, and have undertaken to show that we have peculiar views of the Sabbath, the ministry, and other things. I protest against this mode of attack. (Loud applause.) You have just completed your noble struggle by the abolition of the corn laws. That struggle was maintained by men of all creeds, or it could not have been triumphant. Now, suppose a Baptist had said, I won't go with you in your struggle because you won't be baptized (laughter); and an Episcopalian said, I won't go with you in the corn-law agitation because you won't submit to the bishop. (More laughter.) Why, we do not come together in such struggles to agree about baptism, or Episcopacy, or Independency —we come to agree about one thing, and our one thing is the total and immediate extinction of slavery. (Cheers.) Suppose the alarm bell should ring, and call the city to extinguish a great fire. If a man, before he would assist in putting out the fire, should begin a theological discussion, to know whether you were agreed in doctrine or not, why, you would say that man is the incendiary. (Loud applause.) I declare that men who oppose us on such grounds are no abolitionists. Strong language is needed, for the present position of our society is a vital one. The constitution of the United States is in a compact of slave holding. One party are friends of slavery, and do all in their power to uphold it. Another party—the Liberty party they are called—they go to the ballot-box professing to befriend the cause of freedom, but they put men into power who uphold the accursed system we denounce. Now, we say this is not abolitionism. No friend of freedom can do so. In this sense we are revolutionists. We put on our banner, "No union with slave holders." (Immense cheering.) Now, what have we American abolitionists a right to ask of you Englishmen? You ought not to receive slave holders as honest Christian men. You ought not to invite them to your pulpits, to your communion

tables. Will you see to it that they never ascend your pulpits? If you will, then the slave will bless you, and thanks from the American abolitionists will come over in thunder tones for your decision, and you will give a blow to slavery from which it will not recover. We ask another thing of you. Send us no more delegates to the States, or, if you do, let there be no divinity about them. Nothing but common humanity can stand in the United States. (Cheers.) Send us no more Baptist clerical delegates, or Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Quaker clerical delegates. They have all played to the hands of slavery against the abolitionists. (Cheers.) From Dr. C—— down to the last delegation they have all done an evil work, and have strengtened slavery against us. Like the priest and the Levite, they have passed us by, and gone on the other side. They found the cause of abolitionism unpopular. The mass of society were pro-slavery, so they went with them, and we have gone to the wall. Send us no more if you please. (Cheers.) We have had to say, save us from our English friends, and we will take care of our enemies. There have been those who have gone over to America, and who have nobly stood their ground. They have passed through the fire, and no smell of it has been found on them. That man (pointing to the chairman, Mr. Thompson) has gone through it. (Immense cheering, continued for some time.) Though rising on the topmost wave of popularity at home, he consented to aid us, where he was sure to be mobbed and scouted. But he never blenched. He was not afraid to make himself the friend and companion of the negro; and if he had remained his life would have been taken. If we had desired it he would have remained and hazarded his life; but we said go. Now I don't know if he had been divine he could have stood it. While a man remains common humanity, I can trust him: but when he gets up into the air, where there comes something superhuman about him, I am afraid of him. (Cheers.) Another thing don't do. Send no more men to the south to get money. The Free Church of Scotland is like democratic America stained with blood. It has the price of blood in its treasury. Oh! that Free Church of Scotland! I am for freedom everywhere, and rejoice that church is a free one, but it has received a paltry bribe, and abetted slavery. I have no idea they will send back the money. The laity I believe would send it back, but the divinity prevents it. Would the church but send back the money she would rise to dignity and glory which she has not yet attained. If the money were to go back it would be a death blow to slavery; or if it did not immediately destroy it, it would be a millstone around its neck, which would sink down to the depths of the sea. Then, indeed, the slave holder would howl in anguish, but we would hold a glorious jubilee over a redeemed race. (Great cheering.) Another thing, don't you know that old England is on the auction-block in our country? (A sensation.) You don't know you are under the hammer of the auctioneer! You don't know the presumption of slavery. Should one of your coloured subjects go in a ship to the south slavery would demand that though British subject the coloured man would be imprisoned, and there he would have to lie until the vessel was ready to sail, and the captain has got his clearance papers. That is what slavery does to British subjects in the south. Does your flag wave in mockery over your heads, or not? There is a controversy between you and the Southern States of America. They would sell one of your subjects at the auction block, if the captain were not to pay the expenses of his deten-

tion in prison until he was ready to sail. (Disapprobation.) I want the people of this country to call upon the United States to repeal these wicked laws, or to say that there can be no treaty of amity between you and them. What would the Americans say, if you were to do the same to their subjects? Such is our law, and if there be but the law that is enough, and you ought to demand its immediate repeal. We have a law that all men are equal, and then we have a law authorizing one man to sell another. (Cheers.) Join us then in our efforts, for we are with you. Working men, slavery is your enemy. It works evil for you in the community. It is not democracy which enslaves. I do not denounce democracy. Democracy declares that all men are equal. Slavery does not necessarily exist with it, but in defiance of our republicanism. Never let the minions of tyranny confound republicanism and slavery. It also exists despite of Christianity. I want no Christianity mingled with the institutions of slavery. I want Christianity such as Jesus taught, such as Jesus practically exemplified, a Christianity which knows no colour or clime,—which comprehends us all—which makes the world our country, and all mankind our countrymen. Mr. Garrison seconded the resolution moved by Mr. Wright, and sat down amidst great applause.

A gentleman in the meeting, here asked a question respecting Mr. Garrison's statement as to British subjects being sold in the Southern States. The Chairman answered, confirming the remarks of Mr. Garrison, that such really was the law of the United States.

Mr. F. Douglass then addressed the meeting at some length. He said—The question has arisen this evening respecting the individuals attending the alliance. I wish to say a word about those gentlemen. I have nothing to say with regard to their being slave holders. I believe that none who are in London at the present time are slave holders. Slave holders are not compromising; they are uncompromising in their devotion to slavery; and any insult offered to slavery—the slightest opposition to slavery—is met with stern opposition on their part. They are not men to go into an alliance when they are not invited. It takes cringing, time-serving men to do that; A word with regard to the character of these men. It has been asked if they go the whole length of slavery as we have heard it to-night. No, they do not. But they are, in my opinion, the most deadly opponents of the anti-slavery cause. They do everything in their power to hinder the progress of that cause by misrepresenting the sentiments of the advocates and defenders of the cause of emancipation. I understand that there are some of the British members of the Evangelical Alliance present here this evening. I want to tell you, don't you dare to open your lips against the Roman Catholics depriving the laity of the privilege of reading the sacred Scriptures, without, at the same time, you address those slave holding, woman-whipping Christians in the United States (tremendous applause), who deny to three millions of people the rigt to learn to read the name of the God that made them. Take the occasion, whenever that question comes up (hear, hear), to pour into the unwilling ears of the American delegates the whole truth on this subject. (Loud cheers.) Tell them, that while they keep the Bible from the slave, they are unfit to rebuke the Popish Church. (Applause.) Mr. Douglass, after alluding to the deputation from the Free Church of Scotland, went on as follows:—One rev. gentleman, and I am sorry to say he be-

longs to rather a liberal class in the United States —I allude to the Unitarian body—(hear, hear)—the Rev. Dr. Dewey, while travelling in this country, stung to shame by the constant rebuke of such friends of freedom as Mr. James Haughton, sought an apology for the existence of slavery from the alleged fact, that there is an impassable barrier between the two classes, black and white, in the United States. That is the ground assumed almost universally in the United States. He next stated that the Negro had showed no moral or religious incapacity, and that all they required was, the privilege of education. He then gave a most humorous description of the style in which the Negroes are preached to in the slave-states, and concluded by moving a resolution to the effect, that as man was created in the image of God, he could not have been intended to become his fellow-man's property, used as a chattel.

The Rev. H. Solly, in seconding the resolution, observed, that although we could do little for the slave in his own country, though we could not go over there and help to break his chain, there were many Americans coming over here, and we could let them know what were our sentiments as to the atrocious system of injustice and sin, which is the deep disgrace and curse of their country.

A Mr. W. Collyer, from New York, then rose from near the platform, and, after some time, succeeded in obtaining a hearing. He said that he had been amused and astonished at the addresses he had heard, and the wilful misrepresentations which had been made of the state of slavery in America—(great uproar.) As an American, he said it was base to interfere with their social institutions—(renewed uproar.) He had the care of six thousand slaves—("Oh, oh)"—he was a medical man. The American slave holders did not view slavery as the English do. He could make every allowance for them. The benevolence of their hearts caused them to act as they did; they believed that they were acting conscientiously, justly, and honourably. But the slave holders did not view it in the same light; they were accustomed to it. Mr. Collier then proceeded to enumerate several States in which slavery had been abolished; but happening, in alluding to Maryland, to speak of it as the state that coloured man Douglas came from, he raised a storm of groaning which entirely prevented him from going on with his remarks. He, however, requested the reporters to state, that he had merely used the common phraseology of his country, and had not intended any insult to Frederick Douglass.

The Chirman then called on Henry Vincent, who, in a most eloquent and impassioned address, advocated universal freedom, peace, and brotherhood.

Mr. J. H. Parry seconded the resolution, which passed unanimously. Thanks were voted to Mr. Thompson, for his conduct in the chair, and the meeting broke up about 12 o'clock.

250

AMERICAN SLAVERY.—ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.—At a very numerous meeting, held in the great room of the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, London, Monday, August 17, 1846,

GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq., in the Chair,

Moved by James Haughton, Esq., of Dublin, seconded by William Lovett, Esq., of London, and carried—five persons voting in the negative—

"That we extend the right hand of fellowship to Mr. Lloyd Garrison, the undaunted and steadfast pioneer in the cause of universal emancipation; to Henry C. Wright, the unwearied advocate of the rights of humanity; and to Frederick Douglass, the self-emancipated bondman, and eloquent assertor of the claims of his brethren in chains; and do pledge ourselves to render all the aid in our power to these gentlemen, and their devoted coadjutors of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in the prosecution of their holy purposes for the extinction of American slavery."

Moved by H. C. Wright, Esq., of Philadelphia, seconded by William Lloyd Garrison, Esq., of Boston, U.S., and carried unanimously—

"That we regard with feelings of profound sorrow and humiliation the state of the American churches in relation to the question of slavery, and would earnestly implore the various religious denominations of this country to discharge, in all Christian fidelity, the duty of admonishing those professing Christians in America who practise or in any wise plead for the existence of the foul abomination in their midst; which reduces the image of God to the condition of a chattel and a brute, and condemns to ignorance and perpetual bondage those for whom Christ died."

Moved by Frederick Douglass, a fugitive from slavery in Maryland, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Solly, and carried unanimously—

"Whereas American slavery reduces man, created in the image of God, to the level of a beast, and the condition of a thing, and thus in one act comprehends all that is impious in the sight of Heaven, and revolting in human barbarity; therefore resolved, that the American slave holders, with their abettors and apologists, are to be charged with denying God as the beneficent Creator and common Father of the human race, and the gospel of Christ as of universal obligation and value; with perpetrating heathenism, under the penalties of law; with overthrowing the marriage institution, and destroying all parental and filial relations, by legalizing the traffic in slaves and the souls of men; and exalting the man stealer above all that is called God. Hence, it is the sacred duty of the friends of freedom, throughout the world, to bear their testimony against all such, as the enemies of mankind; and to combine, in every suitable way, for the overthrow of that execrable system which, sustained as it is in the name of Christianity and republicanism, strengthens the power of tyrants, and obstructs the progress of liberty in all countries."

Moved by Henry Vincent, Esq., seconded by J. H. Parry, Esq., and carried unanimously—

"That the existence of slavery in the United States of America has strengthened the cause of despotism throughout the world; and this meeting earnestly appeals to the American people to be faithful to their own 'declaration of rights,' and to decree the extinction of this horrible sin, that despots may no lo ger be able to point to America in proof of the failure of democracy, and thus divert attention from the discussion of principles which are ultimately to establish democratic freedom in all nations."

Carried by acclamation—"That the cordial thanks of the meeting be given to George Thompson, Esq., for his conduct in the Chair." GEORGE THOMPSON, Chairman.

DR. OF YANKEE DIVINITY.

SANDERSON, Printer, Edinburgh.

O have you heard the news of late,
'Bout Slav'ry and its sin so great?
And our braw Free Kirk that used to prate
'Bout rights and Erastian measures
There's C——m, full six feet high,
A Doctor of Yankee divinity,
Who blusters and swaggers, but fights rather shy
With a Thompson or 'Cyclopædia.
The "Frees" think him a wonderful man,
Fiddledee faddldee busky lang, (ang,
But the knowing ones think him an ourang out-
This hero of burgher apostacy.
But we'll not be hocus pocus'd lang,
For back the money it must gang,
Spite of C——m, Candie, and lanky Tam,
Wi' bluidy bawbee buffoonery.

This Doctor brought over in his hat
Three thousand pounds as black as soot,
Some o' them dyed in the double smut
O' slave-breeding Yankee morality.
The price he paid for dollars was "mum,"
Men sold for gain, and women for sin,—
And nothing said he but "Hand me the tin
From that patriarchal fix you are in,
Brothers Numkie Mumkie, short and tall,
With tuzzie muzzie, and pile pall,
What seasons of fellowship I've had with you all,"
Said this Doctor of Yankee divinity.
But we'll no be hocus pocus'd, &c.

This Doctor came home and invited most
Of his clerical friends, (but not to a roast)
And then he showed, as deaf as a post,
His feelings for bleeding humanity.
And though of love to man bereft,
He snid he had the Scriptures left,
And vow'd with them he would make shift
Upon St. Paul the blame to lift.
But Duncan and Grey did very soon
Knock out o' sight the froth o' the "loon,"
The wee bits o' learning and bigs lumps o' soun'
O' this Doctor o' Yankee divinity.
So we'll no be hocus pocus'd, &c.

[illegible]

2,52

The Western Times

EXETER:

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1846.

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

We report in our paper of this week, a brief outline of one of the most important, unanimous, and decided public meetings which this city ever witnessed. The topic was American Slavery, and the speakers were some of our leading liberal citizens, and two visitors from the United States, one being William Lloyd Garrison, who is, we believe, the father of the Anti-slavery movement in the United States, the other Frederick Douglass, formerly a slave, who has escaped from the thraldom of slavery by flight, and having educated himself, now devotes his talents and energies to the cause of his oppressed brethren. The temper of the meeting will be best evinced by the resolutions which were adopted, and which were all carried unanimously. We are no great advocates for the intrusion of one nation into the domestic affairs of another; but Slavery is so terrible a blot upon the character of our common christianity—is a sin of so deep a dye—an enormity of so unspeakable a character—that any just influence which the public opinion of one state, can bring to bear upon the people of another, in order to work out its emancipation, is not only allowable, but is an actual duty. We hope that any Americans into whose hands this paper may fall, will look at the question calmly and deliberately—that they will not think that the people of Exeter are intermeddling improperly in their affairs; but that they are animated by a spirit of pure benevolence and enlightened philanthropy; well assured that the Slave-owner is not only punished by the profitless anxiety to which this system subjects him, but by the countless terrors which are heaped up for him and his successors in the immediate future. One cannot behold the system of Slavery as it exists in the Southern States of America, where the coloured population extends so rapidly, and comes into so close a contact with the civilization and knowledge of the white; without forseeing that before long the system will explode and overwhelm all orders of society in a bloody convulsion—unless God should be pleased to avert the catastrophe, by enabling the American people to see the consequence of their unjust and sanguinary laws respecting slaves. Their vain attempt to surpress every feeling of sympathy on their behalf makes them objects of contempt and reprobation with all Christian nations. When we consider their boasted declaration of independence, in which they lay down as a self evident truth, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an unalienable right to liberty—they must think that the whole of Christendom must be as blind as they are hypocritical and canting, if we do not point to this declaration of independence and contrast with it the institution of Slavery. They profess to have the deepest repugnance to a union of the two races: but a large mass of the slave population are the offspring of that very union which they hold in such conventional abhorrence. Many of these slaves owners thus sell into hopeless captivity their own sons and daughters—this Frederick Douglass, whose eloquent language has excited such deep feelings of indignation against the American slave owners, is supposed to be the offspring of his own master by one of his female slaves.

If he be an average specimen of what this portion of the slave population would become under proper training, there can be no doubt that the system contains within itself the germ of its own violent destruction. Every good Christian will pray however that so awful a convulsion may be avoided, and that the American people may be brought by timely reflection to understand the position in which they are placed before all civilized humanity, and come forward as the British people did, and by a present sacrifice, purchase a lasting and an honorable renown.

SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

A very numerous and respectable meeting was held at the Subscription Rooms, on Friday evening last, convened by public announcement, to consider the question of American Slavery. The room was densely crowded in every part, the great object of attraction being the celebrated abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, and Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave. The powerful eloquence of both these able speakers, and the dreadful narratives which they gave of that monster abomination and national iniquity, *American Slavery*, excited the profoundest sensation.

The proceedings commenced by

Mr. WILKINSON moving that Mr. J. C. Sercombe be requested to preside, which was carried by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN said that nothing but the pressing request of a number of gentlemen, his friends, who were anxious to shew that the religious public in Exeter generally took up the great cause of abolitionism in America had induced him to take the chair. It was however thought necessary that persons of every religious denomination should take part in this demonstration, and enter their solemn protest against American slavery. The object of their meeting was to consider specially the slavery of the United States, and he was glad to see many a friend with whom, in times gone by, he had worked, and met week after week until at last they succeeded in pulling down for ever slavery in the West Indies—(cheers). They had now met to affirm that great principle, that man ought to be free all over the world—(cheers). After some further observations on the gross inconsistency of the United States, professing to be the freest country in the world, and yet supporting, as one of their institutions, a system of slavery more atrocious than the world ever saw: he concluded by calling on the Rev. F. Bishop to move the first resolution.

The Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP rose and said: the resolution he had to propose was one he was quite sure would receive their hearty support. It was to welcome to this city, and to hold out the right hand of fellowship to William Lloyd Garrison, of the United States, and to Frederick Douglass, an emancipated bondsman, from the same country—(cheers)—the eloquent advocates of the cause of freedom for three millions of their fellow men now held as slaves in the United States, and to bid them God speed in their glorious cause—(cheers). William Lloyd Garrison's name is known throughout the United States—known to be loved, he might say revered by the slave, and the friend of the slave, and to be execrated and cast out as evil by the oppressors of the slave and their abettors. He was, as they were aware, the president of the American Anti-Slavery Society; and not only the president, but he was the originator of the abolition movement in the United States, and was the first to promulgate the doctrine of the immediate emancipation of the slave —(cheers). They had the authority of one who had the opportunity of personally observing, to a very large extent, the state of society in America, and who had written largely and well on that subject, for saying that the man of colour and the slaves adored him, and that the blessing of the slaves and the slaves' friends follow in his path. About 16 or 17 years ago, the utmost indifference prevailed in the United States respecting that horrific and iniquitous system. That from two to three millions of our fellow beings were reduced to the conditions of personal chattels, excited no attention—no voice was raised against it—no influential combination threatened its stability —all was indifference, all inaction. William Lloyd Garrison, then a youth, was struck with the sinfulness of this state of things, he felt his soul aroused, and his sympathies awakened, in favour of the oppressed slave, and he nobly determined to devote his life to the cause of the slave's emancipation, and to awake his countrymen to a sense of their iniquity—(cheers). No sooner had he made public his intention, and attempted to influence the people by lectures and writings through the press, than the hand of persecution was raised

against him. The union was moved from its centre to its circumference, and the people were every where excited against him. He received letters from the southern states, containing the most atrocious threats, accompanied by pictures representing a human being, hung by the neck until he was dead; and assuring him that the bowie knife was ready for him. It was a common topic of conversation that William Lloyd Garrison would ere long be assassinated—still his noble spirit quailed not, and though cast into prison—the same where that noble hearted man, the Rev. Mr. Torry, an independent minister, was afterwards confined, and who was martyred (having died in prison) for giving refuge to a fugitive slave—he would not prove recreant to the cause. He was put in prison at Baltimore for speaking the truth in reference to the conduct of a slave owner to his slave. His spirit was still unquelled, his zeal undaunted—his aspiration still rose from his prison cell in favour of the oppressed, and when at length liberated from prison he left on the walls of his cell the following beautiful record of the feeling which animated his mind—

I boast no courage on the battle field,
Where hostile troops immix in horrid fray;
For love of fame I can no weapon yield,
With burning lust an enemy to slay.
But test my spirit at the blazing stake,
For advocacy of the rights of man
And truth—or on the wheel my body break;
Let persecution place me 'neath its ban;
Insult, defame, proscribe, my humble name:
Yea, put the dagger at my naked breast;
If I recoil in terror from the flame—
Or recreant prove when peril rears its crest,
To save a limb or shun the public scorn,
Then write me down for aye—*weakest of women born.*

—(loud applause.) Soon after his liberation Mr. Garrison started a newspaper—his means were not large, and he (the rev. speaker) believed he was not letting out a secret when he told them that, in order to carry it on, he, for some time, lived in a garrett on bread and water—(hear, hear, and cheers). His was, indeed, a self-sacrificing spirit, recommended to us, and exemplified before us, by our common Saviour. They well knew who it was said, "by their fruits ye shall know them," and well had he proved his zeal and benevolence and philanthropy. Mr. Garrison had been blamed for using harsh language—he would, therefore, read a passage from the first number of the *Liberator*, in which he justifies himself, as it was always his constant principle to call things by their right names. He says "I am aware that many will object to the severity of my language. Is there not cause? I will be as harsh as truth, as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think or write with moderation; tell a man whose house is on fire to give moderate help, and tell me to be moderate in this cause. I will be heard." "I will be heard"—such was the prophetic declaration of William Lloyd Garrison on the 1st of January, 1831. He has been heard—his voice has been heard by the slave, and has carried support to his down trodden soul. It has been heard by the slave owner, and has caused him to fear that his unholy and unrighteous system shall be put an end to. It has been heard by the friends of humanity—everywhere has his dauntless spirit spread. His noble career, his pure faith that his cause is the cause of God, and of justice, of humanity, and of truth, is everywhere taking root. It has nerved the weak, encouraged the timid, cheered the brave, and excited us all to more animated exertions in the holy cause of humanity and freedom—(cheers). We welcome him—(a tremendous burst of applause.) We welcome him to this meeting. We tell him we wish him God speed—(renewed cheering). That our fervent prayer is that his valuable life may long be spared—and that he may live to see the blessed fulfilment of labours so nobly commenced, so consistently carried on—(cheers). Of our brother to my right what shall I say of him. You will all respond to the declaration, when I say, "We welcome Frederick Douglass"—(immense cheering)—the self-emancipated bondsman—the eloquent asserter of the rights of humanity—the living refutation of those who contend for the natural inferiority of our coloured brethren—(cheers). We welcome him. He will have not merely our good wishes, but our earnest practical sympathy, our practical support, and in any way in which we can consistently aid both our friends we shall be happy to do so—(cheers). I will not detain you longer except to express the hope that we shall soon see that glorious consummation when the fetters shall be struck from the limbs of the slave, and this fearful pest on the people of America be suffered no longer to exist. The reverend gentleman then read the resolution, and resumed his seat amid much applause.

R. T. Abraham, Esq., solicitor, briefly seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Chairman then introduced

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, who was received with enthusiastic shouts of welcome. He is indeed an extraordinary man—no one could ever casually look at his grave and thoughtful countenance, beaming with love, and tinctured with a shade of profound melancholy, without feelings of the deepest interest. Although under 40, his head is quite bald, and he bears strong traces on his countenance, of the severe intellectual labor he has gone through. . So benignant is his appearance, that it is said, a southern slave-owner once bought an engraved portrait of him, to which no name was attached, framed it, and hung it up for a year or two in his house, struck with the benignant aspect which it exhibited, and showing it to his friends as the ideal of pure humanity. When however he found whose portrait it was, it was at once destroyed. His voice is clear, calm and modulated, in the most harmonious tone, and inspired a feeling in his hearers of veneration and awe. It may be said of him that he has the courage of a hero, the fortitude of a martyr, the piety of a saint, and the zeal of an apostle. The cheering having subsided, he said that he had been taken by surprise on the present occasion, as he came not to the meeting to hear any panegyric on his humble labors in the United States. in the cause of abolition. He could more easily encounter an American mob, than he could receive panegyrics which he did not deserve. But their welcome was gratifying, because he was conscious that they were on the side of emancipation, and the knowledge that they had washed their own hands at last in innocence, with regard to slavery in their colonies, all these things filled his soul with joy and gratitude—(cheers). How different was it on the other side of the Atlantic; there, there were but few to plead in favor of the slaves emancipation—but few addresses were delivered in favor of the liberty of man. There the uncompromising champion of emancipation, must be prepared to lose his character, and his good name; to make himself of no reputation—to be treated as the noble army of martyrs and confessors had been treated of old; to have nothing to cheer him in his rugged path, but his faith in God, and in the righteousness of his cause; and though assailed and persecuted, that faith and trust had never forsaken him. He took no credit to himself that he had been the pioneer in the Anti-slavery movement in the United States. He who should come to them with a true heart at the 11th hour, should also receive his reward and be joyfully accepted. "Not unto us, but unto thee, Oh Lord be all the glory"—(loud cheers). He felt happy to be in this land of England, where no slave can exist—here the declaration of the poet is not an hypothetical allusion but a sober truth. Slaves cannot breathe in England—(cheers). If their lungs inhale its air, that moment they are free—they touch your countrv's soil, their shackles fall from them. Would to God, said Mr. Garrison, it was so in the land of my nativity. Oh, how does it happen that it is not so—that the people who in 1776 rose up in vindication of man's rights, and separated from the mother country in the name of liberty, are now the people who of all people on the face of the earth, are the greatest slave-owners, and consequently the worst of hypocrites. Why is it, as our respected chairman asks, that these things are in that boasted land of liberty the United States. Sir, it is because they who thus undertook to declare their regard for liberty, were not sincere in that declaration—they did not take the whole human race into their consideration—when they declared that self evident truth, that God had made all men equal—(cheers). At that moment they were aspersing the cause of justice and truth, for their slaves chains were clanking around them—(cheers). At the time they were declaring that all men were equal, they held half a million of human beings as slaves. From that hour to the present moment, they have bent all their energies towards increasing the number of their victims, and spreading slavery and the slave-trade. For this, am I here to night to ask you, to lift up your voice against the land of my birth—not to reproach them in an evil spirit, but to bear righteous testimony against the people of that land, as denying christian truth—acting in opposition to their own boasted republican professions, and embarrassing the march of liberty throughout the world—(cheers). I rejoice that in regard to this great cause of humanity, that it is indeed a broad one, it is not sectarian, it is not national. No. Overleaping all these distinctions; passing by all these boundaries, of sect, or creed, or nation, or colour, I say "my country is the world, and my countrymen are all mankind"—(great cheering). I am then no foreigner on this question, I come to you as a brother, as a countryman, a member of the same common family—having the same father over us, the same Redeemer to lead us to happiness and immortality hereafter—(loud cheers). He then went on to give some particulars as to the rapid increase of slavery in America. At the time of the declaration of independence, the number of slaves was about 500,000 their market value about 200 million of dollars; at the present time

their number is about three million, and their market value 1,500 millions of dollars. When the constitution was formed in the United States, they had seven free states, to six slave states; now they have 15 slave states, and only 13 free; thus it will be seen that slavery is increasing with frightful rapidity. America is almost entirely under the control of the slave powers. Whether they turned to the state government or to the internal and domestic governments of the country, they were altogether controlled by the slave owners, public opinion was with them, and no man could be popular or successful in that country, who did not bow down and worship this slave holding Moloch. At the time of the separation in 1787, when the Colonies became independent, it was agreed by congress that slavery should be for ever prohibited in the North, and North Eastern states: but should be allowed in the South and South Western. But the desire of the slave owners to extend their territory was always insatiable, and they cast about for an opportunity of increasing it. This was afforded them by the purchase of Louisania from the French, during the administration of Thomas Jefferson in 1804, and that colony, although admitted into the Union as a single slave state, is of such enormous extent, that it can be subdivided into several states as large as Massachusets, and this subdivision is a trick which the slave owners well understand, as they found it a convenient mode of increasing their influence in the state legislature. He then referred to Florida, which was the next country obtained by America, still for the same purpose, the extension of slavery—and then he came to Texas. He had not time to go into the whole of this nefarious transaction—the annexation of Texas, he said, was in his opinion, one of the most dreadful deeds ever consummated since man was placed on the earth, It appeared that in 1829, Mexico passed a decree for ever abolishing slavery in her dominions—this excited the ire of the slave owners of free America, and from that moment Texas was doomed. A number of Americans established themselves illegally in that country, then declared themselves independent of the mother country Mexico—and then annexed themselves to the United States, Mexico being too weak to prevent it, for the express purpose of extending the horrid system of slavery, and of re-establishing it in that vast country. Thus it is, said Mr. Garrison, that the cause of liberty is trampled under foot, and broad as our country is, no man can go into any part of it, but he will have to confront the demon of slavery. Let him go into our Northern States, or our remotest provinces, there he will meet the demon, and if he speak on behalf of the slave, it is at the peril of his character, or his life. Let him go anywhere, he will find it not only omnipresent, but omnipotent and omniscient. I ask then, is it surprising that so few can be found willing to suffer the loss of all things dear to them, and to lay down life itself, that his country may be redeemed. I speak not in behalf of myself, but I have done what I could—thank God I believe that the terms of that resolution are true. If I did not know that I have never faltered, never compromised, never turned my back on the enemy, I should blush to stand here—(loud cheers). The slave owner I know will not say that I have yielded; and I am sure that the poor bleeding broken-hearted slave will never say it, of the the brave men and the glorious women who are associated with me; the truest of the true on earth—they belong to those of whom the world is not worthy—united as they are calumniated as they are—yet passing through the fire, and going through the flood, and coming out of all trials and tribulations rejoicing with the song of victory—(loud cheers). They would not wonder at the growth of slavery, when he told them that it was part of the original law, under which the federation was formed, that it was incorporated into the rational government, and that to overthrow it, the national government must be overthrown. He explained that at the time of the war of independence, there were two great parties, the free states and the slaves states; these states could have no interest in common more than Christ with Belial; yet, having no faith in the ultimate triumph of truth and justice—the Northern States from a fear of being reduced by England, entered into an agreement, by which they were bound hand and foot to the support of slavery, engaging themselves to do nothing to put down slavery, and pledging themselves that no spot in the whole union should be safe for the escaped slave, who was to be delivered up to his master wherever he might be found; and thus becoming the prison-keepers to the slave owners. That agreement was made 60 years since, and they have been faithful in carrying out this horrible pledge to the letter. Hence the American abolitionist finds himself reduced to this extremity; either to turn his back on the Anti-slavery cause, or no longer to stand by the constitution; for to uphold that pledge would be to involve themselves in the guilt of the slavery system. They had taken their choice, and declared themselves as far as the government were concerned "moral revolutionists." They would have

no union with the slave owners religious or political. It was the strong arm of the North, which enabled the slave states to keep three millions of people in chains. If the struggle were only between the slaves and the slave owners, the two hundred and fifty thousand, or perhaps three hundred thousand masters on the one hand, and the three million slaves, armed with the conciousness of right on the other, how long would the struggle last? A struggle for liberty against the most cruel, the most cowardly oppressors of all men on the face of the earth. It was the strength of the North which would crush to the dust every attempt of the slave to obtain his freedom, and make slavery interminable amongst them. Were they not friends of humanity—friends of God and of Christianity, when they said they would not longer uphold that blood-stained Government? He then went on to notice the arrogant and aggressive system pursued by the United States in reference to their foreign policy—they would not be content with Mexico. Already they were fomenting, by means of their emissaries, divisions between the descendants of the French and Spanish colonists of Hayti. Cuba was watched with a jealous eye by these slave owners; it was a settled design of America to seize Cuba. There was no limit to the ambition of these slave owners, they meant to subject the world if they could—(hear, hear). They had bought Louisania, stolen Texas, and were now claiming Mexico as their own; and yet theirs was "the land of the free and the home of the brave" and every 4th of July they sent up their prayers to heaven, and thanked God that he had made all men equal. He knew of no hypocrisy in any nation equal to this people's—their hearts were become adamant—could they believe in God or have any faith in Christianity. They could not be republicans—slavery is not the legitimate child of republicanism, which says that all men are created free and equal. How then could slavery, which tramples on human rights, and degrades the image of man into a beast, be the child of a republic. He would now refer to a few prominent features of American slavery—he did so because he was satisfied that few in this country comprehended what American slavery meant. He found many persons very sensitive when slave holders were charged with being thieves, robbers, and man stealers, and they considered they were rather in the light of unfortunate men, who did not know they were perpetrating a great crime. Such was too much the feeling in the United States itself—there slavery was become a household word; it met with no condemnation, and it was slave owners who furnished their statesmen—received their votes—were doctors in divinity, and preachers in their pulpits—(cheers). But that single word comprehended a description of men who were of all men the most guilty, the most abominable under the sun, and their unhallowed system led to practices the most dreadful, the most cruel that the world ever heard off. Since he had been in this country he had heard people talk of the famishing condition of the poor man here, and say we have enough slavery in England, why need we trouble ourselves about this slavery which is three thousand miles off. Now any man who says that there is slavery in this country is either ignorant of what is meant by slavery, or he is a hypocrite—(cheers). Any man who attempts to run parallel between the poorest of the poor in England, and the best fed slave in America, and gives a verdict in favour of the slave, shows that he is dead to every feeling of liberty and fit to be himself a slave—(cheers). He was not there to apologise for British oppression, of which there might be too much—his heart bled for the suffering millions of this country—(cheers). But what did they gain by falsehood. Nothing. Show him the poorest man in the kingdom—he did not care how mean he was, how ragged, how little food he could procure. He knew one thing that if he should ask him if he would go to America and become a southern slave, he would knock him down, unless he should happen to be a non-resistant—(loud cheers). He knew he would say at once

> "Better to sit in freedom's hall,
> With a cold damp floor and a mouldering wall,
> Than to bend the neck and to bow the knee
> In the proudest palace of slavery"—(cheers).

That was the spirit of Englishmen. Now the slave gets a peck of corn a week, do not your poor get more than that, do they not get some little variety? A peck of Indian corn a week, two meals a day, the one taken about ten in the morning, the other after the toils of the day are over, when he is too happy to be released, and allowed to go back to his miserable hovel, where all must mingle promiscously on the cold floor with nothing to cover them. Here he endeavours to make his little hoe cake in the best way he can, and he has hardly caught a brief interval of sleep 'ere the cursed sound of the slave owner's lash, awakes him from his troubled dream, and he is again marched out to the rice field, to waste the few years which constitute the wretched remnant of his life in this ceaseless

hopeless labor—(hear, hear). You have hardly begun to run the parallel; yet you can go no further. I ask if men are whipped here to drive them to their work, could you serve the humblest man in England so—(cheers). How many mutilated bodies bearing the mark of the lash or the brand of the iron can you produce? The British law would step in to protect the humblest individual, whilst the American slave received no protection whatever—(cheers). He would now give them a few specimens of the use of the whip extracted from southern newspapers—not the testimony of abolitionists, but the testimony of slave owners themselves, circulated all over the land. He then read the following extracts, "Committed to jail as a run away, a negro woman named Martha, 17 or 18 years of age, has *numerous scars of the whip* on her back." "Ten dollars reward for my woman Seby, *very much scarred about the neck and ears by whipping.*" "Stolen, a negro woman named Celia. On examining her back you will find *marks caused by the whip.*" "Was committed a negro boy named Tom, *is much marked with the whip.*" "Ran away, a negro fellow named Dick, has *many scars on his back* from being *whipped.*" "Committed to jail, a negro slave, his back is *very badly* scarred." "Committed, a mulatto fellow, his back *shows lasting impressions of the whip,* and leaves no doubt of his being a *slave.*" "Ran away, a negro man, named Johnson, *he has a great many marks of the whip* on his back." "Ran away, Bill, has *several large scars* on his back, from a *severe* whipping in *early* life." "Ran away, negro fellow John, from *being whipped has scars on his back, arms and thighs.*" "Left, my negro man George—has *marks of the whip very plain* on his thighs." "Brought to jail, a negro man named George—*he has a great many scars* from the lash." "Committed to jail, a negro boy named John, about 17 years old—his back *badly marked* with the whip, his upper lip and chin severely bruised." Now he (Mr. Garrison) would ask whether among the poor of England, there was anything like this—he was sure they would answer no.—(loud cheers.) They should now see how the religious public of America acted in this matter, the Reverend John—we could not catch the surname, a presbyterian preacher, frequently on a Lord's day morning, tied up his slaves lashed them, left them bound, and went away to preach, and on his return would finish their scourging. Mrs. Spence of Rockingham, used to boast that she was the best hand to whip a wench in all the county. She always whipped her slaves on a Sunday, and on being once asked the reason, she replied if I whipped them on any other day, I should lose a day's work, but by whipping on the Sunday their backs get well by Monday morning. He would now come to another remarkable feature of slavery; was it the fashion here, to put iron collars about the necks of their labourers, to mangle them and to see these victims carry their manacles about the country. There is no such thing as a chained labourer in England; now what is the practice in the United States. He would read some more extracts. "Ranaway a negro named David—with some *iron hobbles around each ancle.*" "Ranaway negress Caroline—had on a *collar with one prong turned down.*" Ranaway, a black woman, Betsey—had *an iron bar on her right leg.*" "Was committed to jail, a negro named Ambrose—has a *ring of iron* around his neck." "Ranaway, the negress Fanny—had on *an iron band about her neck.*" Ranaway a negro boy named James—said boy was *ironed* when he left me." This is another view of American slavery, and it is enough to fill the earth with shuddering.—(hear, hear and cheers.) Are you in the habit of putting burning irons into the flesh of the poor in this country; we do this in regard to our slaves: listen to the following. "Ranaway, a negro woman and two children; a few days before she went off, *I burnt her with a hot iron* on the left side of her face, *I tried to make the letter M.*" "One hundred dollars reward for a negro fellow, Pompey 40 years old, he is *branded* on the *left jaw*" "Was committed to jail, a negro man says his name is Josiah, his back very much scarred by the whip, and *branded on the thigh and hips in three or four places, thus, J M.*—the rim of his right ear has been bit or cut off." All this running to see if these poor fugitives can find protection, not under the star spangled banner of the United States, for wherever that waves there is no protection for the slave—but under Victoria in Canada, where thank God some 15,000 persons once slaves are now enjoying liberty and safety, having succeeded in escaping from their Southern Prison House.—(tremendous cheering.) There is another practice which these slave owners resort to, that, of mutilating their slaves. This is done for two reasons, first by way of punishment and to gratify the malevolence of their masters, and in the next place to make their detection more easy in case they should attempt to escape—hence it is a common practice to extract the teeth, to draw sound front teeth so that their slaves may be easily identified. The African race generally have remarkably good teeth, consequently it is not to be attributed to disease, but is a systematic

portion of slavery. Advertisements like these are very common in the Southern newspapers, "committed to jail, Ned, about 25 years of age, has lost his *two upper front teeth.*" "Ten dollars reward for Mary, *one or two upper teeth out*, about 25 years old." "Ranaway a boy named Moses, *some of his front teeth out.*" "Ranaway *Sally, her front teeth out.*" "Ten dollars reward, Ranaway Julia a negress 18 or 20 years old. *She has lost her upper teeth* and the under ones *are all broken.*" Now (Mr. Garrison continued) conceive of the monstrous cruelty of thus extracting teeth at that age for the horrible purpose of identifying their slaves;—and yet this is done by people who dare to call themselves a christian people—who boast of their revivals of religion, who make many prayers, who talk loudly of their sanctuaries and their sanctuary privileges—multitudes of them are church members, very exact in regard to ceremonial observances, assure us that they are born of God, and yet are all this time thus treating their slaves—men, as much as they are and stamped like them with the glorious image of the divinity.—(loud cheers.) He then remarked on another practice of slavery, that of hunting down fugitive slaves with blood hounds—he could read them many very painful and very horrible narratives of the sufferings endured by poor slaves under this head. Some had been actually torn to pieces by these ferocious animals, others so mangled as to be disabled for ever after. With regard to the slave trade, his countrymen boasted that they had washed their hands in innocence of its horrors; in a great measure they had, but it was only to substitute a worse system, that of a domestic slave trade. Maryland, Virginia Kentucky and North Carolina were now slave breeding states, it was the most profitable method of employing capital, and since the acquisition of Texas, the value of slaves reared in Maryland and Virginia, had risen to the amount of from fifty to an hundred thousand dollars per year; in these States, slave children are "raised" for the market the same as cattle or pigs. Washington, the capital of this glorious republic, was the head quarters of this system—there, under the star-spangled banner, any man could qualify himself for dealing in human flesh and blood, by taking out a license which cost 400 dollars—(hear, hear). Now all this, he continued, appertains to the physical man—if slavery could only stop there, it would be, in some degree, tolerable; but it is the war which it makes on the image of God, on the intellect of man, on the immortal soul of man, the war against knowledge which makes it so utterly intolerable—where it extends, no slave may dare to read; the Gospel is withheld; and all which makes him a man is so far as possible blotted out—these are the hideous features of the system. It is because we deny, as abolitionists, that the religion which sanctions this system is a divine religion—because we tell the people that such a religion is not that of the church of Jesus Christ; but a synagogue of Satan, a cage of unclean birds—for this we are denounced as infidels—(cheers). We say that a religious man cannot be a man-stealer—the religion of the north and the religion of the south, for here they are one and indivisible, says, let him go and buy as many slaves as he can, and we will hold out to him the right hand of Christian fellowship. Now the abolitionists are infidels to all this, they dare to say that the minister of Jesus Christ never held a slave—never apologised for slavery—but like his Divine Lord is always on the side of the oppressed—(loud cheers). If this is infidelity I glory in it, and I stand here to say, that one of the severest and the longest struggles that the abolitionists have had, has been to vindicate the Bible as an anti-slavery book, against the American churches and the American colleges—for years have we been struggling to vindicate the Bible as an anti-slavery book, against the American churches and the American colleges—for years have we been struggling to vindicate the church of Christ against the foul aspersion that it is a church upholding slavery, and to prove that our Lord and Saviour is on the side of the oppressor—(cheers). We say that the religion which prevails in America, is nothing better than heathenism—a religion which forbids the Bible to be distributed under pains and penalties. Can we believe, that that can be a true religion? No. We must, therefore, declare to the world, that as for the religion of slave-owning America, it is a spurious religion, and it is time it was sent to its own place, the bottomless pit. Thank God he has not left himself without witnesses in that country; there are at least 7,000 men who have never bowed the knee to Baal, and they are increasing daily—(cheers). One object of my coming here is to see if the Christians of this country will not say that slavery is utterly unchristian, that slave owners can have no part in Christianity, whilst they remain such. Nothing keeps slavery alive, but its supposed Christian character—the moment that it is denounced as infidelity, it will die—but it comes to us in the name of Christianity, and, therefore, it is asked why they should be ashamed of it. That this was the view taken of it in America he proved by reading several documents—the first was an extract from a work by a southern slave owner, who says, "The most important view of the subject is the religious one—for assuredly, if slavery be adjudged as

sin—if it be adjudged as sin—if it be condemned by the revealed will of God—then in Christendom it cannot exist. * * * I may assert with confidence that there is no fact in history or no proposition in ethics better established, than that slavery is recognised both in the old and new testament." He also quoted Dr. Fuller of South Carolina whose remarks were to the effect that if Slavery be a sin, then it was the immediate duty of the masters to abolish it whatever might be the result—but that slavery if they believed their bibles, was allowed in the patriarchial, and the prophetic ages, and is not condemned by the new testament—*If it be a sin* to hunt a fellow being with blood hounds, to use the branding iron and the lash as the instruments of robbing a human being of his rights—such was the language of America.—(cheers.) Slavery is sustained in America by all religious denominations—there may be exceptions, but these exceptions are few and far between, and do not affect the truth of the general assertion—and were it not for the apologies for slavery grounded on its being sanctioned by the bible, which are continually made by those who are the religious teachers of that nation—they should long since have seen it abolished. Therefore Christians of England, if you have any regard for pure christianity—if you desire to see the gospel of Jesus Christ prevail throughout the world—lift up your voices against that religion, which in the name of Christianity itself, enslaves your fellow beings and tramples on every holy tie. You ask what you can do—I know you are willing to aid us, and you can do so by multiplying your earnest remonstrances against slavery. Let me assure you there is not the slightest whisper which is uttered in this country against the wickedness of American slavery—but it is immediately conveyed to us there, by that great sounding board the press, which God has made to break on the slave holder with a voice of thunder.—(cheers.) You cannot undervalue these addresses. I rejoice to find myself here in Exeter, I remember a short time since when in the spirit of peace, you the women of Exeter sent over an address to your sisters the women of America, in the name of peace, and against the spirit of war.—(cheers.) I was present when in the midst of an immense assembly, in a room much larger than the present, that address was unfolded—it was received with thunders of applause; the peaceful sentiments it breathed penetrated the hearts of every one, and it had great effect in promoting the cause of peace in our land.—(loud cheers.) Women of Exeter; mothers, daughters, sisters, wives; there are mothers, daughters, sisters, wives, in slavery in our country, will you not help them—will you not sympathise with them—will you not lift up a voice in their behalf—will you not send out a word of writing to us who are labouring in their cause. I am sure you will do so; and I promise that it shall be seen by thousands in all parts of the free states, even if we cant say so for the slave states, but the slave owners themselves shall see it—(loud cheers). I have been promised a remonstrance on the part of the operatives of this country—thank God they are free to sign their names, or to make their marks—they will do so. I have been assured by two or three of the leading friends of the working classes, that they are prepared to do so. I was asked if one signed by two hundred or three hundred thousand of the working men of this country would do any good. Any good! I was thunderstruck. Yes, it will do good; send it to us, we will take it to that old Cradle of Liberty at Boston, to Faneuil Hall—there it shall be seen, read, and promulgated through the length and breadth of the land. He then referred to addresses from other classes suggesting that the Tories, if there were any, could help them. After all the worst that could be said of them, they were lovers of liberty and honest men. If they could get addresses from the religious denominations of all persuasions, it would be of the most important service; he referred to deputations from religious bodies, which had left this country for America who had done much harm to the anti slavery cause, by freely associating with the so called religionists of America, and thus keeping their iniquity in countenance. There was another view of the subject. What has England to do with the practice of slavery in this moral and religious republic. He would tell them the slave powers of America undertake to put England herself on the auction mart, and to dispose of her to the highest bidder. He knew they would not understand him when he told them that England is a bond slave in the southern plantations, and is liable to be bought or sold in her markets. By the laws of the slave states of America, a British subject venturing into a southern port for the purposes of trade is liable to be taken out of his vessel, shut up in the slave prison away from the protection of the British flag until the ship sails, when, if the expences of his maintenance in the jail are not paid, he is sold as a slave. If the English should venture to use an American seaman in that way, he was sure the old spirit of 1776 would again burst out. Faneuil Hall would be crowded, the people would begin to talk about Lexington, and Concord, and Bunker's Hill, and would never cease until they had put an end to such a restriction. After a few more

remarks, Mr. Garrison sat down amidst great applause.

The CHAIRMAN presumed that Mr. Garrison, in the latter part of his speech, referred to coloured British subjects.

Mr. GARRISON—Certainly. By the slave laws of America all free coloured persons, on their arrival in these states, are to be seized and thrust into prison, and there kept until the vessel which brings them shall take them away again. The American States were very tenacious of this claim, which they said was a matter of life and death to them—for, with the example of a free negro before their eyes, it would be impossible to keep their slaves from insurrection.

The following resolutions were then proposed, seconded, and carried unanimously. Able speeches were made, which we have not room for :—

Moved by Dr. BARHAM, seconded by JNO. DYMOND, Esq., "That this meeting regards with amazement and horror the existence of a system of slavery in the United States, by which three millions of the population of that country are subjected to every conceivable form of cruelty and degradation, bought and sold in the market, and held in the fetters of a helpless servitude."

Moved by WM. DREW, Esq., seconded by R. W. FOX, Esq., "That the American people must either openly repudiate their declaration of independence—in which they affirm it to be "a *self-evident* truth, that all men are created *equal*, and endowed by their Creator with *an inalienable right to liberty*"—or stand justly accused before the world, and at the tribunal of Heaven, as guilty of unparalelled hypocrisy."

Moved by JAMES TERRELL, Esq., seconded by Rev. N. HELLINGS, "That this meeting, animated by an earnest desire for the welfare and prosperity of the United States, cordially proffers its sympathy and good wishes to the uncompromising abolitionists in that country, represented by Messrs. Garrison and Douglass on the present occasion, and trusts that they will continue to press onward until the last fetter shall be struck from the limb of the last slave on the American soil."

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, an escaped slave, then rose, and was received with overwhelming enthusiasm. He said—he really thought on rising that he should feel great embarrassment, but the hearty manner in which he had been received had removed what little embarrassment had arisen when he looked on this extraordinary and crowded meeting. He would not allude to the resolutions, which embodied all that he could say on the subject—but would address a few words to them in reference to the great principle on which they should co-operate in removing slavery from the United States. When he first thought of the interference of British christians with slavery in America, he was somewhat fearful that that interference would do their cause an injury rather than a good. But his mind had undergone a change on this question, and he now believed that England possessed a power, superior to any power in the United States to operate against slavery—(cheers). Some sins, some evils in communities, could be best removed by the virtuous efforts of individuals composing these communities, but it was not so with slavery. That is such a monstrous system, such a giant crime, that it begets a character favourable to its own existence, vanquishing the moral perception, and blinding the moral vision of all who come in contact with it; and a nation has not the moral energy necessary to its removal. He therefore felt himself abundantly justified in calling in the aid of all christians—of all who were of good report in the British nation to testify against American slaverv. He felt he was not only at liberty, but justified in directing the attention of all the world, and fixing on it the indignant eye of condemnation from every portion of the globe. He felt that that general voice of indignation would be effectual—the slave owners were sensitive, and would writhe under it. Well had the poet Campbell said of their flag—

> Your banner bears two emblems,
> The one it freedom claims,
> The other that it bears
> Reminds you of your chains.
> Of white man's liberty the types
> Stand blazing in your stars;
> But what's the meaning of your stripes ?
> They mean your negroes scars—(great cheering.)

Slave owners wither under these sharp rebukes, they feel that it is true, and they will be ashamed of that deed of deep damnation. It is then important that England should bear her testimony against this system—you have done much already, yet much more remains for you to do. They had whispered the truth—he was there to call on them to speak with a trumpet tongue, and in such a language that the slave owner in America could not misunderstand—(cheers). Let no distinction be made between the slave holder and his sin—let England taunt the slave owner with his sins, treat him as a sinner, regard him as a sinner, and their testimony could not fail—(cheers).

A great deal had been said about deputations, his friend Garrison had hoped that no more would be sent from religious bodies in England, unless they sent better men—(cheers). Another gentleman (Mr. Hellings) had said something in extenuation of the deputation sent out some years since by the Baptist denomination. Now, said Mr. Douglass, I wish to say something about a deputation in order that you may learn from what they did in favour of the slave owner what you may do against slavery. In 1844, the Free Church of Scotland sent out a deputation, consisting of five ministers of that denomination, who were to represent their church in the United States. When the slaves of America heard of a *free* church, we had reason to believe that the day of our redemption drew near. Knowing nothing but slave churches before, we had reason to believe that a free church indeed had arisen in the midst of us, and that at least the deputation would have demanded emancipation for the long oppressed down trodden slave—(cheers)—but no such thing. They left us with the intention of going into the slave states, but before they left New York, they were earnestly remonstrated with against going into the slaves states of the Union at all —they were told that they would have to sacrifice their principles, and stain their cause with the contaminating touch of slavery. But they accepted the slave holders invitation, took their money; paralysed their own Christian feelings, turned a deaf ear to the groan of the slave as they went on their way through the South—were dumb on the question of slavery—were invited by the slave owners to their pulpits—dined at their tables, sat in their pews—heard them preach to their slave congregations—took the blood money which was offered them, and brought it to Scotland, to pay the free church ministers—(loud cheers), I charge them with having gone into a land of manstealers—among men whom they knew to be manstealers —they struck, for the sake of money, for the sake of filthy lucre, an alliance with these men—went into their country, saw millions of slaves driven to the field, treated like beasts—denied even the right to read the word of God, that being a crime severely punishable—and yet they never raised a whisper against it, because they received this blood money from the slave owners—(loud cheers). I say this much that it may be borne on the wings of the press to that Free Church of Scotland, and that they and the friends of the slave owner may know that the Christian people of England have a controversy with them on this question. Englishmen gave money to this Free Church, and the dissenters lavished their silver and gold on them—we want you to say certain words to them, which they will understand. Tell them to send back to America that blood stained money—(cheers). Dissenters of England say to this Free Church of Scotland, that your money and the blood stained money they received from the slave owners of America shall not clink in the same coffers together—(immense cheering). Say to them, send it back, for by sending it back, a great work will be done on behalf of the slaves' cause in the United States. The Free Church has the power of doing a noble work, and of giving slavery a blow that shall send it reeling to its grave, as if struck by the bolt of heaven—(great cheering). They have the power to raise such a question in the southern states as never was raised before. Let them send it back also, because it does not belong to them—the Free Church of Scotland has now stolen money in her treasury, and the English Christian knows it. I say then to the dissenters who shake hands with these slave owners—whether in the Evangelical Alliance or out of it—that they are shaking hands with men who are wielding the bloody lash over three millions of men, passing from time into eternity. Sir, I want to speak to you of the religious condition of the slaves in the United States—three millions of people under the drippings of the American sanctuary, are denied the right of marriage—think of it—imagine what must be the state of society there—and yet this is in a land of Bibles, in a land of churches, in a land of missionaries—you will not believe it. It is creditable to your humanity that you are unwilling to do so—yet it is, nevertheless true. That is the practice of the American Church, and I mean by the American Church, the combination of all those bodies, ranging under the names of Methodist, or Baptist, or Presbyterian, or Unitarian, or Episcopalian, and numberless others whose names would take up half the evening to enumerate. These I regard as the Church of America, and under the sanction of this church this state of things exists. Sanctified man stealers are members of these churches; women are sold to pay for the communion service in these churches; men are sold into slavery to pay for the churches themselves, or to send the Gospel to the Heathen. The slave prison and the church, stand next door to each other, and the groans and cries of the poor slaves are drowned in the hymn of praise of the slave's religious master. The blood-stained gold, the price of the slave goes to support the pulpit, and the pulpit in return covers this infernal business with the garb of

christianity—(immense applause). The man who claimed to hold these hands, and to own me as his property *(Thomas Halls)*, he is a Methodist, a class leader in that church; yet I have seen that wretch tie up by the two hands a young woman only eighteen years old, strip her and keep her half suspended, and standing on the ends of her toes for five hours at a time, and lash her with the bloody cowskin, until the warm blood dripped in a pool at her feet; and repeating at the time this passage of Scripture, "He that knoweth his master's will and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." It would be out of place to speak much of myself—(loud cries of no, no). I have known what slavery is by experience. I have felt the slave driver's lash, and I carry those marks on my back, and they will accompany me to the grave. I was a Methodist, it was not until I was satisfied that that church was upheld by and guilty in every way of upholding slavery, that I became willing to say a word against it. My case is the case of thousands associated with my friend Garrison, who have rendered themselves obnoxious because they opposed churches which recognised slavery. We have been constrained to arrive at the position that the American churches and clergy are unworthy of christian regard and the christian support of this country, or any other country, and that they ought to be abolished. I believe that slavery finds its strongest support in the church, and the church for this charges us with infidelity. Like Garrison, I care not for these charges coming from that source; because I believe in a religion based on the broad foundation of love to God and love to man. I believe in a religion which makes it the duty of its votaries to visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and to keep yourselves unspotted from the world—(cheers). I believe in a religion which makes it our duty to regard the liberties of our neighbours—(cheees)—and because I do believe in this religion, I hate that man stealing, woman whipping religion which is professed in the United States—(cheers). I come now to what I wish the people to do. I want you to deny christian fellowship to this slave holding church. I demand I claim it as the duty of Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and all denominations in this country, to have no fellowship with the American churches, hence, and for ever to separate from them, until they shall have washed their hands from this guilt; unless you do that, you must become in part responsible for slavery in the United States—for while we give to the slave owner the Christian name, and throw around him the garment of Christianity, and endorse his character as a good Christian, so long will he glory in his shame, and drive his slaves to the field unrebuked and undisturbed—(cheers). You must, therefore, bear your unmitigated testimony to the American people against this iniquity, by dissolving all partnership, and disavowing all religious connection with them. Why does slavery exist in those States? Because it is respectable; that it is so considered, is evident from the fact that ministers of religion are slave owners; that the President of the United States is a slave owner, that the diplomatic body, who represent that country in every foreign State, are slave owners. Slave owners are found in the Congress and in the Senate, in every department of the American government, and in every place south of Mason and Dickson's line—(hear, hear). We wish to make it disreputable; it is not so because of that character of Christian which it has invested itself—we come to this country therefore to raise the curtain on its iniquity, and to show the dreadful deeds done in the name, and under the sanction of Christian churches, and to ask you to lift your testimony against such churches—and to sever your Christian relations with them. Remember here are 3,000,000 of people without Bibles—whilst you are sending your Missionaries and your Bibles to the remotest ends of the earth, and are straining all your energies to carry Christianity to the heathen. While at this very moment, you have an Evangelical Alliance now sitting with the avowed purpose of making war against the anti-Christian character of the Church of Rome—because that church, they say, is acting in opposition to the doctrines of Christianity, by discountenancing the reading of the Scriptures among its laity—here is slavery depriving three millions of their Bibles—denying them the right to read the word of the God who made them—to teach them to do so is an offence punishable, if committed a second time, with death in Christian America—(great sensation).

Some slight interruption took place, in consequence of a gentleman wishing to address the meeting; he had attempted to before Mr. Douglass began, but the meeting being impatient to hear Mr. Douglass, the chairman decided against him.

Mr. Douglass then resumed, and made some further observations on the religious character which the advocates of slavery give it in America. Not only do they quote Scripture in palliation of it, but justify it as an institution of divine appointment—not only to

be permitted, but enforced as being sanctified by the express command of God, and universally obtaining, under the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensations. He then remarked on the character of the sermons preached by these friends of humanity to their slave congregations; the topic generally insisted on was the necessity of obedience of their slaves to their masters. He said he would give them a specimen of the sort of sermons which it had been many times his fate to listen to. He then buttoned up his coat, twisted his countenance into a grave and canting aspect, and with a most inimitable tone of voice, and a genuine Yankee twang, gave the following sermon amidst shouts of laughter: His text was "Servants obey your Masters." "You should obey your masters, said the preacher, in the first place, because the Lord has commanded you to be obedient. This reason alone will be sufficient to induce obedience on that part of my audience who believe it to be their duty to obey the Lord in all things. But it may be asked by some of you, why are we to obey the Lord? I say obey him, because he is all wisdom, and knows what is best for you to do—because he commands it, therefore, never stop to ask whether it is right or wrong, but be obedient to your masters. You should obey your masters in the second place, because your happiness is dependent on your obedience. Ah servants! this is an important consideration, one to which you will do well to attend to. Wherever you see wretchedness, want, misery, poverty, or distress, oh! remember it is in consequence of disobedience. Oh! is this the case with you. In order to elucidate my meaning, allow me to state a fact. Sambo, there, was sent by his master some time ago to perform a certain amount of labour, which, had he obeyed his master's orders, would have taken him two hours and a half. His master was a pious man, and after waiting for the expiration of that time, he went into the field where Sambo should have been at work, and lo and behold, there lay Sambo's hoe in one place, and Sambo fast asleep in another. Oh! servants, think of this pious master—his commands disobeyed, his work not done—his authority thrown off. Oh! I say, think of the trying position in which this kind master was placed. To the Law and to the testimony he went to know his duty in the premises—there he read. "He who knoweth his master's will and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes." He therefore took Sambo up and lashed him, so that he was unabled to work for a few weeks. Now then servants I want you to bear in mind this, that Sambo's whipping was caused solely by his disobedience. Oh! then let me exhort you, if you wish to be well fed, well cared for, to bask in the sunshine of your masters' favour—let me exhort you to be very obedient to your masters. You should obey your masters in the the third place, because of the sense of gratitude with which you should be inspired, by the knowledge of the fact that the Lord in his mercy, brought you from Africa to this christian country. Oh servants! you cannot too highly estimate the kindness of the Almighty in bringing you to this country. Africa bleeding Africa—dark benighted Africa; no gospel there—no sanctuary privileges there—but universal darkness and despair every where prevails, The Lord saw you in that condition, bowing down to stocks and stones, and worshipping Images the work of men's hands. Seeing you in this wretched state, he put it into the hearts of good men, such as the excellent and zealous Bishop Newton, to leave their homes and their families, and dare the fury of the waves, to snatch you as a brand from the burning and bring you to this christian country. Think how many slaves are now in the kingdom of heaven, which never would have entered that kingdom if they had not been brought to this christian country. Such sir, said Mr. Douglass, is the miserable twaddle—the humbug palmed off on the poor slave as the blessed gospel of Jesus Christ. Sir they go further still; they say to the negro "You should obey your masters, because of the dependant condition in which you find yourself placed. Behold your hard hands and your strong frames, your masters and mistresses have soft hands and delicate constitutions, and white skins; whence this difference; "it is the Lord's doings and marvellous in our eyes." But, Oh servants, while you have strong hands and strong frames remember that the relations resulting from it are reciprocal—for while you have strong frames and robust constitutions, you have not the gift of intellect—you could not think for yourselves—you could not provide for yourselves—so the Lord in his infinite goodness has given you kind masters to think for you—(laughter). Oh the wisdom of God!" I know, he continued, this will strike the audience as being the merest caricature, you have never heard of anything of the kind out of the slave states—but had I time I could read you sermons and resolutions of religious bodies, declaring sentiments identical with this—think then of three millions of people subjected to such teaching as this within 14 days of your own island. I demand of you then if you are friends of the Missionary enterprise, that you should demand the admission of your mission-

aries amongst these slaves—that your missionaries should go into the midst of them. Tell these slave-owners, that you will not be recreant to the duty of him who has told you to go forth to all the world, and to preach the Gospel to every creature—(cheers). If you sit silently by, and see Christianity robbed of its glory, the Bible denied to the people, and never make an effort to extend the Gospel—and give the Bible to the people—I tell you, you will be recreant to the cause of truth, recreant to the cause of God, and recreant to the cause of humanity—(great cheering). Of my friend Mr. Garrison, and I call him my friend in no platform sense of the term : I feel him to be my friend—the friend of the friendless—the friend of the slave—the friend of the negro in the United States—I could not but feel the strongest emotions of delight, when I saw the responsive feelings which his eloquence called forth from time to time in this great audience on behalf of my race—(cheers) I too thank you all on behalf of my brethren in bondage, for the patient hearing you have given me. I shall go back to that land, although I go back in the face of danger—for there is not one spot of ground in all that United States, in which I can stand free, whether in the North, South, East, or West; over-shadowing me is the terrible probability of being sent back to that slavery from which I have fled. But whatever dangers may await me, however dreadful may be my fate in that country ; though the blood hounds may be upon my track, I shall go back with the proud satisfaction, that although I may be made a slave of—although I may be struck down—although I may be killed to satisfy the fierce vengeance aroused against me on account of my running away, and of my exposure of their iniquity in this country. I shall carry with me the proud satisfaction of having enjoyed at least one year of freedom in this glorious country—(tremenduous cheering). Of that year of freedom I cannot be deprived, and it is almost enough of happiness for one who has been twenty-one years of his life in the bondage of slavery to enjoy such a year of freedom—(cheers). I tell you that it is a good thing to be in England, I like it, I feel that the representation made by the great Curran is not an extravagancy when he says that British law makes all men free as soon as their foot is set on British earth—no matter what language they speak, or on what dark spot they happened to be born. I feel it to be true. I will go to the land of my birth, I will proclaim it in the ears of the American people, whether I'm in a state of slavery or freedom, while I have a voice to speak it shall be raised in exposing the guilt of the slave-owners, and in contrasting the munificent freedom of monarchical England, with the slave-holding, man-stealing, woman-whipping, degradation of democratic republican America—(loud cheers). I have this glorious scene here, it is Daguerrotyped in my heart, I shall go forth in the land of my birth, and tell them of the thousands and tens of thousands who have heard with indignation of their oppression—of the brave men and the feeling women who have listened with shame to the story of their woes. Oh! Mr. President, I wish all the slaves of America could peep in, could see us just as we are, and know as I know, the sympathies of this audience for their down-trodden spirits—(vehement cheering). Mr. Douglass having reiterated his thanks, sat down amidst the loudest plaudits.

Mr. Wilkinson then moved the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Latimer, and carried unanimously :—"That an Auxiliary to the Anti-slavery League, lately established in London, be formed in this city, and that the following be appointed members of the committee, with power to add to their number—J. C. Sercombe, William Drewe, Rev. Francis Bishop, T. Latimer, R. W. Fox, Dr. Barham, R. T. Abraham, Edward Henning, James Terrell, Rev. John Bigwood, Rev. N. Hellings, and J. P. Nichols."

Mr. Garrison then took a solemn farewell of the audience. As he was about to set out for Scotland and Ireland, prior to his return to his own country, it was most probable that they would meet face to face no more.

Mr. Bishop announced that Mr. Douglass would again address an audience the next evening, an intimation which was received with cheers.

The thanks of the meeting were then voted to the Chairman by acclamation, and at eleven o'clock the meeting separated.

THE MEETING ON SATURDAY EVENING.

On Saturday evening, the Subscription Rooms was again crowded to excess, to hear Mr Douglass, so intense was the interest excited by the proceedings of the previous evening. The Rev. F. BISHOP proposed, that Edmund Hennings, Esq., father-in-law of the late Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, the friend and associate of Wilberforce should take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN opened the proceedings by reading a letter from Lord John Russell to Sir T. Buxton, dated many years back, strongly denouncing any encouragement to slavery. He contrasted this with Lord John Russell's conduct in bringing in the Sugar Bill which he hoped every one in the room would oppose.

Mr. DOUGLASS said, that as he understood there was some fear of misapprehension as to the Wesleyan sermon he had endeavoured to represent to them last night, he should this evening draw their attention chiefly to the religious aspect of slavery in America, in order to satisfy them that the picture had not been overdrawn, and that he was only desirous of showing them the difference between a false and a true profession. In the course of his remarks he read a variety of advertisements, all including an acknowledgment or avowal of the connexion between slavery and the different religious bodies in the United States. In one the public were informed that a gang of ten negroes highly recommended would be sold, said negroes being the property of the Independent Church! On another occasion, the will of a highly evangelical lady had been proved, by which she bequeathed one-fourth of her live stock to "The Missionary Society, for the publishing of the Gospel among the heathens." The most conclusive document of the evening, was an extract of a "*Sermon* to be preached to slaves," published by one Bishop Meade, of Virginia, (as we understood of the Episcopal Church), to which he had boldly taken the text "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." "This," expounded the Bishop, "ought to be—Do to others as you *would* wish they should do to you, if you were in their situation, and they were in yours. Now, servants, you see if you were in your master's position and they were your slaves, wouldn't you wish them to be obedient and careful, and do all they could to improve and take care of your property? Of course you would. It's quite natural. So you see you ought to do the same for them." [The argument, said Mr. Douglass, amounts to this—that if any ruffian should present a pistol at the chairman's head and demand his money, it would be his duty to give it up; because, of course, if he were the assailant, and the robber in his position, he would wish the purse to be given up to him.] He then read the following extract from the sermon, to prove that the sermon he had given the night before was no caricature—"Almighty God hath been pleased to make you slaves here, and to give you nothing but labour and poverty in this world, which you are obliged to submit to, as it is His will that it should be so. * * * Take care that you do not fret or murmur, grumble or repine, at your condition, for this will not only make your life uneasy, but will greatly offend Almighty God. * * * Now when *correction* is given you, you either deserve it, or you do not deserve it. But whether you really deserve it or not, it is your duty, and Almighty God requires that you bear it patiently. You may, perhaps, think that this is hard doctrine, but if you consider it right you must needs think otherwise of it. Suppose, then, that you deserve correction, you cannot but say that it is just and right you should meet with it. Suppose you do not, or at least you do not deserve so much or so severe a correction for the fault you have committed, you perhaps have escaped a great many more, and are at last paid for all. Or, suppose that you are quite innocent of the crime laid to your charge, and suffer wrongfully in that particular thing, is it not possible you may have done some other bad thing which was never discovered, and that Almighty God, who saw you doing it, would not let you escape without punishment one time or another? And ought you not in such case to give glory to Him, and be thankful that He would rather punish you in this life for your wickedness than destroy your souls for it in the next life? But suppose that even this was not the case (a case hardly to be imagined), and that you have by no means, known or unknown, deserved the correction you suffered, there is this great comfort in it, that if you bear it patiently, and leave your cause in the hands of God, He will reward you for it in Heaven, and the punishment you suffer unjustly here, shall turn to your exceeding great glory hereafter." The reading of the above excited marked expressions of disgust. Mr. Douglass then took a rapid review of all the religious bodies in the United States, with relation to their connection with slavery. He read a resolution passed by the Wesleyan Methodist Society, stating that "they considered slavery a divine institution, and had neither right, *desire* or *intention* to interfere with, the relation

between masters and there slaves. All the other religious bodies had slave holders among them, both of their clergy and laity, with the exception of the Quakers, whom every black man looked on as his friend. Still tho they had no slave holders among them, they gave a negative support to slavery by closing their doors to all discussion on the subject, which had caused the secession from the body of a few brave men who wished to pass resolutions denunciatory of slavery. What he wished was to see the religious bodies in this country, refuse all communion with them until they had wiped out the stain. If this were done he believed slavery would not live five years longer. Mr. Douglass concluded by an eloquent and gallant appeal to the ladies, on behalf of the bazaar to be held in Philadelphia, for the benefit of the cause. It was desirable that contributions should be forwarded by the end of Septen ber.

The Rev. FRANCIS BISHOP moved a resolution expressive of the thanks of the meeting to Mr. Douglass, and pledging themselves to do all that they rightfully could to undo the heavy burdens of the three millions of slaves whose cause he so ably advocated. Mr. NICHOLLS seconded the resolution.

R. W. FOX, Esq., then proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by G. W. TURNER, Esq., who assured the lecturer that in whatever clime he might have been born, while he laboured in the cause of humanity, he had more respect for him than the highest potentates of the earth. Let him go on in his course, and he would perform a higher part on the theatre of life, than it was the lot of many to possess and enjoy.

To the Editor of the Western Times.

Sir,—As I shall have left this neighbourhood before your next publication will you kindly give insertion to the following explanation relative to the Anti-Slavery Meeting held in Exeter yesterday evening, as I am anxious to prevent any misconception of my views and motives, if such have arisen.

My attendance at the meeting was purely accidental, and certainly I had no intention of taking any part in the proceedings, much less of interrupting them. I heard the greater part of Mr. Garrison's speech, the tone of which struck me as not being the best calculated to promote the sacred and important objects of the meeting. A resolution having been moved and seconded; it was stated by some one that any observation relative thereto, should be made previous to its being put to the meeting, which induced me to request permission to make a few remarks thereon.

I was not unmindful of the impatience naturally felt to hear Mr. Douglas, and I resolved for my own sake as well as that of the meeting not to occupy a moment longer than I could avoid, and nothing but my sincere desire to promote the *permanent* objects of the meeting, could have induced me to trespass upon its attention. Having, I hope satisfactorily explained what might otherwise be misconstructed, I congratulate myself that my views upon the subject were in a great measure participated in by yourself, as was evinced by the excellent remarks made by you, at a subsequent period of the meeting.

Permit me to observe, that I entertain as strong feelings of hatred and abhorence at the inhuman and unchristian practice of slavery as any individual at that meeting, and that I have been long convinced, that it will be found in the long run dangerous and unprofitable. I believe that God has not left himself without witness in this important matter, but that he can and will vindicate his laws and his justice, by showing that they were conceived and designed to promote the temporal and eternal welfare of his creatures.

I take it, that slavery is an attempt to gain by unjust and indirect means certain *ulterior* advantages from the physical powers of the slave. Now, it is a mere truism, that the greatest return from human labour can never be obtained, except where a perfect harmony exists between the physical and mental powers of man; a state totally incompatible with slavery. I know, from experience, that one free and intelligent labourer under a system of piece-work, with the full conviction of reaping the reward of his labours, will prove more profitable. than three men sent from the dispiriting habitation of a union workhouse, to fill up the tedious time by listless and despairing toil, without any impetus to exertion or hope of reward.

My chief regret arose from the assertion of some rev. gentleman, who assumed that I desired to interrupt the proceedings, and contended that being a *stranger*, I had no right to address the meeting. I do think it would be a great source of satisfaction to the *American* slave-owuers, could they know that at such a meeting called for the *express purpose* of denouncing *their* conduct, a person favourable to the objects of such a meeting was prevented giving

expression to his opinions, on the ground of *being a stranger*, thereby giving a sanction to the objection raised by the Americans, that the British people have no right to interfere with their internal arrangement and domestic economy.

There is something peculiar in the state of America, which being a young and partly undeveloped country, has grown up under a system of slavery: and doubtless, there are many genuine lovers of liberty in that country, sincerely anxious to wipe out the stain that slavery has impressed upon her national character. My confidence is in the increasing spread of knowledge, and that as all vice is folly, so it will in the end be found that free-labour is not only more productive, but cheaper also, and much more conducive than slavery to promote the permanent welfare and security of all nations.

I cannot take my leave without acknowledging the courteous and hospitable kindness I have received during this first short visit to Devonshire, the beautiful scenery and auspicious climate have impressed me with a sense of delight which will not be easily effaced, and which even this trifling incident is not sufficient to mar. Relying upon your love of truth and well known integrity, to give insertion to this letter, I remain dear sir, with great respect, faithfully yours.

C. H. LATTIMORE.

Park Crediton, Aug. 29th, 1846.

CHRISTIAN SLAVERY!

The meetings held at the Subscription Rooms last week, and the disclosures there made by Mr. Garrison and his sable coloured colleague, Mr. Frederick Douglass, have excited considerable interest, and awakened the sympathies of all who attended, on the behalf of the slave population of America. The startling announcement of 3,000,000 of human beings in the United States, subject to the accursed and accumulated horrors of slavery, and a large proportion of them in the possession of professing Christians, is a subject to be deplored, and is humiliating and degrading to the feelings of humanity. Every denominational section of the church appears, by Mr. Douglass' statement, to be guilty of the enormity of which he complained; his charges were levelled indiscriminately against *bishops, priests, deacons, and flock*—all classes have, and are engaged in trafficking in human flesh and blood, with brutalizing cruelty. He however fearlessly took off the masks from their hypocritical countenances, and displayed them with stains of blood upon their brow, rendered ridiculous, as well as disgusting, by their being blended with pale-faced meekness, and the professed smile of Christian love; standing forth with bold effrontery, endeavouring to establish their wretched practices upon the rock of scripture truth, and to prove them not contrary to its precepts, and its injunctions. Never was such blind infatuation as this! Never was scripture more grossly perverted! And yet, strange to say, these are the men who profess they have the very key of knowledge, in reference to every experimental doctrine of our holy religion—they who talk of the convincing, enlightening, comforting, assisting, and instructing influences of the Holy Spirit; and yet upon this horrible traffic in human blood and man stealing, which is classed by St. Paul with the murderers, and adulterers, and every and all the most abominable vices which can be enumerated, they profess not to be able to discover that it is contrary to "sound doctrine." "Prove that it is sinful, and contrary to the religion of Christ," say they, with apparent sanctimonious sincerity, "and the system must and will be abolished;" as though there was no spark of selfishness in their hearts, but only a pure desire to act in accordance with their profession. Such a declaration as this, in the enlightenment of the nineteenth century, must emanate from the most desperate and hardened hypocrisy, or the God of this world must have blinded the eyes of their understanding to a degree of darkness unparallelled; and what is still worse, all the boasted advancement of scripture knowledge in our own land is but a "bag of moonshine," provided our Divines cannot prove that the practice of man stealing, and slave-dealing is sinful. But they can do so if they chose, and they certainly ought, in the most demonstrative, clear, and positive manner, show the fallacy of their specious dogmas, and thus put the American slave-dealing christians to the test, whether they are willing to discontinue their nefarious traffic upon being convicted by fair arguments, or whether they will act without hypocrisy, throw off the borrowed cloak of religion, and appear in their true characters, as lovers only of the mammon of unrighteousness. Hence we see the propriety and necessity of adopting the course suggested by Mr. Garrison, and Mr. Douglass, of the christians of England making a decisive and prominent movement in strengthening the efforts of the Anti-slavery league, by their united co-operation in a christian spirit; and

thereby assist them to prosecute the great and noble work they have undertaken, until success shall crown their efforts, and right shall overcome might, and the oppressed shall go free.

If, on the other hand, the various denominations of christians, or any of them, shall in consequence of feeling themselves aggrieved (I speak advisedly,) by the serious charges brought against them by the Anti-slavery advocates, of never rebuking their slave holding brethren—never remonstrating with them on their soul-destroying and demoralizing traffic; but tacitly by their silence sanctioning its continuance, until the Anti-slavery League began to kindle a blaze of enquiry and condemnation, that was likely to consume the silent abettors, with the actual perpetrators of this heinous sin, into non-entities of christian principle.—If, in consequence of this, they consider themselves justified in standing on neutral ground, and therefore will not unite in christian effort with the League in those justifiable and scriptural measures which they have suggested; then will it appear, whatever may be their profession, that they are destitute of that philanthropic principle which should be the chief characteristic of human nature, when influenced by the all-absorbing spirit of true christianity. It is vain for them to assert that we have nothing to do with the workings of the internal system of the American policy, that we ought not to interfere with their social and political measures—they might, with just as much propriety, assert that we have no right to interest ourselves concerning heathenism and idolatry. American christian slavery is far the most deplorable and despicable—the former is the result of ignorance, the latter of detestable selfishness cloaked by hypocrisy. Besides, most of the religious denominations in America are directly or indirectly associated with the various denominations in our own country, consequently, we have greater means of access, and a better prospect of success; therefore, if we do not, as christians, exert ourselves to the utmost in discountenancing and denouncing the abominable traffic, and thereby endeavour to induce the Americans to remove the foul stain from their christian character, we shall, and must remain, under the suspicion, at least, of being "partakers of their evil deeds."

A WESLEYAN.

Exeter, 31st August, 1846.

Mount Radford, Exeter, Sept. 2nd, 1846.

Sir,—The *Anti-Slavery* meetings held at the Royal Subscription Rooms on the evenings of Friday and Saturday last, have been the subject of much judicious talk and interested sympathy. God forbid that I should refrain from joining in those christian feelings—I trust I shall yet live to see that happy day when the slaves of every hue and every clime shall stand forth in all the enjoyment of perfect freedom. Having been an eye witness of the extent to which this unnatural system is carried on in America, I do rejoice to hear that the matter is being so ably represented throughout our highly favoured land as it is. I trust the Exonians will one and all pledge themselves to do what they can in order to its total and universal extinction at the earliest period possible.

But one circumstance I deeply regret: I refer to the very painful position in which the dissenters of England (especially the Wesleyans) were placed by the uncourteous, unqualified, expressions, made use of by *Frederick Douglas*, the fugitive slave of America, whilst addressing the meeting, expressions which were fully calculated to convey the idea that the Wesleyans of England especially (both ministers and people) were opposed to the principles of Anti-Slavery—sanctioned and supported slavery by continuing to hold out the hand of fellowship with those of the American methodists—both evenings contending that that particular section of Christ's Church were more culpable than any other sect, nor would he hear anything in extenuation. Now, sir, I consider this to be at once both unwise and unjustifiable. Facts, numberless facts can be adduced to show that it is far different than to what Frederick Douglas asserts. The zeal at all times manifested by the Wesleyans in the total abolition of slavery; the rejection of individuals in society who are in any way connected with this odious traffic; and the reports of the annual Conferences of the ministers of that body—must fully convince every reflecting mind that the statements of Frederick are altogether unchristianlike and untrue. I have been informed that at the last annual Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Ministers held at Bristol, it was asked—Whether the Conference could adopt any further measure for the entire abolition of Slavery? The Conference, deeply convinced that Negro Slavery is one of the foulest of our national sins, and ought on grounds strictly religious to be strenuously opposed to all who fear God—the Conference earnestly recommends our members and friends who now are and hereafter shall be, to use their best exertions to promote the early and entire abolition of the brutal and inhumanising principles of Slavery.

Surely after this I need say no more, but I do much regret that *Federick Douglas* should so bemean himself as to venture upon such grounds without any qualifications.

JUSTIA.

The Lament of the Irish Emigrant

1

I'm sitting on the stile Mary—
Where we sat side by side—
On a bright May morning long ago,
When first you were my bride.
The corn was springing fresh & green,
And the lark sang loud & high—
And the red rose on thy lip, Mary—
And the love light in your eye.

2

The place is little changed, Mary,
The day is bright as then;
The lark's loud song is in my ear,
And the corn is green again!
But I miss the soft clasp of your hand,
And your breath upon my cheek,
And I still hear, listening for the words,
You never more may speak.

3

'Tis but a step down yonder lane
And the little church stands near—
The church where we were wed, Mary,
I see the spire from here;
But the grave-yard lies between, Mary,
And my step might break your rest,
For I've laid you down to sleep,
With your baby on your breast.

4

I'm very lonely now, Mary,
For the poor make no new friends,
But oh! they love the better far,
The few our Father sends!
And you were all I had, Mary,
My blessing & my pride,
There's nothing left to care for now,
Since my poor Mary died.

5

Yours was a brave good heart, Mary,
That still kept hoping on
When the trust in God had left my soul,
And thy arms young strength was gone,
There was comfort even on your lip,
And the kind look on your brow;
I bless you for that same, Mary,
Though you can't hear me now.

6

I thank you for the patient smile
When your heart was fit to break,
When the hunger pain was gnawing then,
And you hid it for my sake!
I bless you for the pleasant word,
When your heart was sad & sore;
Oh! I'm thankful you are gone, Mary,
Where grief can't reach you more.

7

I'm bidding you a long farewell
My Mary kind & true!
But I'll not forget you darling —
In the land I'm going to;
They say there's bread & work for all
And the sun shines always there;
But I'll not forget old Ireland,
Were it fifty times as fair!

8

And often in those grand old woods,
I'll sit & shut my eyes,
And my heart will travel back again
To the place where ~~[illegible]~~ Mary lies;
And I'll think I see the little stile
Where we sat side by side
And the spinning Corn & the bright May [mean]
When first you were my bride.

THE HUTCHINSON FAMILY AT PHILADELPHIA.

(From the Pennsylvania Freeman.)

Many dastardly acts have been perpetrated in our mob-ruled city, but none within the scope of our knowledge has ever been attempted, all the circumstances considered, more contemptibly flagitious than that brought to light in the following card, which appears in this morning's papers :—

"Particular Notice.—Postponement.—The Hutchinson Family would respectfully apprise the public that their vocal entertainment, advertised for this evening, December 30th, will not take place. The Musical Fund Hall was engaged by them for the purpose of holding a series of concerts, which were to have been concluded next week. But since the announcement of the entertainment for this evening, the trustees of the said hall have given notice that, at the warning of the mayor, the admission of persons of colour could not be allowed, and would be positively prohibited. As this was no part of their contract, and as they could not do any act that would seem to sanction such a course, without compromising one of their well-known and most cherished principles, they therefore, under the circumstances, feel themselves virtually excluded from the hall.

"Purchasers of tickets for this evening's entertainment can have their money refunded for said tickets at the places where purchased.

"Philadelphia, Dec. 30th, 1846."

We are at a loss for words with which to characterise this transaction. The card only tells part of the story; all the circumstances need to be known in order to form a proper appreciation of the outrage. It is too near the time of our going to press, however, to go into a minute detail of the facts, but the main ones are in brief as follows :—

The Hutchinsons came to this city about two weeks since, according to previous announcement, to give a series of concerts. The Musical Fund Hall was engaged for their use, and the public was on tip-toe to hear them. They had always been great favourites with the lovers of true music and moral purity in this city, and the brilliant reputation they had acquired since their last visit, which was nearly two years ago, made their numerous friends and others still more desirous again to hear them. Their first concert was crowded to excess, and their songs were listened to with the most rapturous applause. The same was true of their second and third concerts, with the exception, that the crowd was not so excessive, and that, mingled with the plaudits of the audience, were heard here and there a few faint hisses. The occasion of these was their singing—according to announcement in their programme, and according to their invariable usage at all their previous concerts—of one or two pieces of an anti-slavery character.

In addition to these hardly noticeable exhibitions of displeasure on the part of a few, might be observed in the countenances of a still smaller number, slight manifestations of restiveness at the presence of a few respectable coloured persons, who, according to the well-known practice with the Hutchinson family, were admitted, on paying the usual price, to the enjoyments of the concert. Everything went off well, and every night the singers were cheered by their large and respectable audiences, with the strongest testimonials of approbation.

On Saturday evening, however, about the time of opening the Hall, Mr. Jesse Hutchinson, who attends to the business concerns of the family, and who makes it part of his duty to keep the door, was waited upon by a person understood to be the mayor's clerk, and notified that he must make arrangements to exclude all coloured people, or there would be a mob. Mr. H. replied that they could not make any such arrangement in consistence with their principles or sense of propriety. He was afterwards informed that if he did not the mayor would do it for him—else there would be a mob. His reply was—"The mayor must then come and do it, for I shall not." This was the substance of the conversation. The clerk left. Coloured people (a few highly respectable ones only presenting themselves) were admitted; no mob came, neither did the mayor; the concert went off—with the exception of a slightly increased hissing when anti-slavery sentiments were sung—with the usual *eclat* and manifestations of delight by the audience.

Nothing further transpired till Monday morning, when—after the family had left for an excursion to Wilmington—Mr. Beckett, the superintendent of the Musical Fund Hall, came to their lodgings, and failing to see them, left word with the gentleman with whom they were staying, that his orders were, if the Hutchinsons should persist in singing their anti-slavery songs, and admitting coloured persons to their concerts, he should close the doors of the hall. This, of course, was considered by the Hutchinsons' friends and others—for it was soon rumoured through the city—as a high-handed outrage, but no action could be taken in the premises until their return. In the meantime, their agent, in pursuance of his instructions, went on to incur the usual expense of advertising, printing handbills, programmes, &c. On Tuesday morning the family returned. They were soon visited by the superintendent, who made known to them the conditions on which they were to be allowed the further use of the hall. This led to an interview between Mr. J. Hutchinson and some of the trustees, at which the objection, mentioned by Mr. Beckett, to their singing anti-slavery songs was withdrawn, and the issue raised on the question of their admitting coloured people. The exclusion of these was demanded, and the reason urged was that they (the trustees) had warning from the mayor that there was danger of a mob, and that if they allowed coloured people to enter the hall, on them would rest the responsibility. At the request of Mr. H. to make their statement in writing, the following cautiously written but disgraceful note was, after some study and consideration, drawn up:—

Hall of the Musical Fund Society, Dec. 29, 1846.

Gentlemen,—We have been warned, by the mayor of the city, that the introduction of negroes among the whites at your concerts would expose us to the danger of a riot, and we have had terrible examples of the injuries and outrages committed by mobs excited on such occasions. We have therefore to inform you that we have instructed the persons in immediate charge of the hall, not to admit the coloured people into the saloon.

FRANKLIN PEALE,
On the part of the Committee of the Hall.

Messrs. Hutchinson.

The manner in which this demand was met by the Hutchinson family has already been learned from their card. They, of course, could not consent to go into the hall on such degrading conditions. A proper sense of self-respect, consistency with their well-known, and, as they express it, "most cherished" principles, and a just regard for the rights and feelings of others, forbade the acceptance of such terms, and they promptly rejected them. And not choosing to contend for reparation for their violated rights and injured feelings, and unwilling to incur the risk of a similar difficulty, by engaging—if it were possible, especially at so late an hour—another hall, they have given notice that there will be no concert, and have made arrangements for leaving the city.

"extreme and extravagant?" Did they stand forth as the defenders of the delegates whom I had censured, both abroad and at home? Did they pronounce the conduct of their dissenting brethren towards the guilty American Churches, harsh, unchristian, and anti-apostolical? Did they take the slaveholding churches of America under their sheltering wing, and seek to assuage their mortification by the balm of their fraternal sympathy? Did they hold me up as a disturber of the peace of Zion—an enemy of religion—an accuser of the brethren—a sower of the seeds of dissension? Did they characterise our remonstrances as "the clamours of a mob?" Did they say, "we were wise above what was written?" Did they fly to their Greek Testaments and Hebrew Lexicons to find passages to justify the title of a slaveholder to "a seat at the table of the Lord?" Did they do any of these things? No; far from it—they did the very opposite. Their zeal outstripped the zeal of all their Christian brethren of other denominations. While I was yet in America, they sent forth a book recommended in a preface, in which they introduced my humble name as a guarantee for its authenticity, and called upon the religious people of Scotland to ponder well the contents. It was a picture of American slavery—a true picture—a picture drawn by an eye witness, that witness a brother Presbyterian clergyman. They told the people of Scotland, "They believed they could not render a greater service to the cause of true religion, than by printing and circulating that book." Here it is. It was printed in Glasgow, its preface was written in Glasgow, and is dated May, 1835,—eleven years and one month ago. It was endorsed by the Cunninghams, Lorimers, Buchanans, Gibsons, Beggs, and Candlishes of that day. They made it their own, and commended it to the very people whom they have recently led out of the bondage of St. George's Hall, into the liberty of Canon Mills. Here it is. Let us take a peep at it. What do we find upon the 69th page?—

"Slavery and cruelty cannot be disjoined; consequently every slaveholder necessarily must be inhuman. Its hideousness may be modified in exhibition; or it may exist in different degrees, according as social circumstances, or the physical or mental constitution of the slave-driver may exert its influence; but the peculiarly ostensible features are paramount, and cannot be obliterated; for there is indelibly inscribed upon this whole mischievous conspiracy against God and the rights of man, and unless they repent of their unequalled wickedness, upon its ungodly impenitent artificers, 'BLOOD, DEATH, and DAMNATION!'" [Great applause.]

This is virtually, and by deliberate adoption and recommendation, the language of the present leaders of the Free Church, in 1835. If they deny it, let Mr. M'Phun produce the manuscript of the preface—let him be brought into court to say who instructed him to print the book—who paid the bill—and who instructed him as to the mode of circulating it throughout Scotland. Let us dip a little deeper into this enlightening volume. What have we on page 73?

"If a slaveholder proclaims pure gospel truth, every sentence which he utters speaks his own reprobation; for the instruction of the slaves, and the existence of slavery can hold no more 'fellowship than righteousness with unrighteousness; and no more communion than light with darkness.'

"This opposition to all the means of spiritual and moral improvement among the slaves, cannot be extirpated unless by the immediate extinction of the whole system."

Hear, then, ye dolts, who are constantly saying, "let the slaves be instructed; let them be made partakers of the benefits of religious education." Dr. Cunningham tells you that a slaveholder proclaims his own condemnation when he preaches a pure gospel; and that the only way to achieve the spiritual and moral improvement of the slaves is to abolish immediately the whole system.

Again, on page 71, what do we find?

"As a natural result (of slavery in America), the worship of God, domestic, social, and public, is either partially or wholly discarded. Genuine Christian prayer and slavery cannot be conjoined. What can be more shockingly absurd than the petition, 'forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us,' *uttered by a slavedriver* in the presence of his slaves, whom he robs, starves, and scourges; and whose tears, tortures, and blood daily cry to Heaven for retribution? What more awful than the general exclusion of slaves even from domestic worship, where the form is so inconsistently maintained? What more criminal than *the death-like silence of Christian ministers of all denominations, in the southern states*, upon the various topics of slavery, its unrighteous principles, its corrupt motives, its diabolical acts, its incestuous defilements, its sleepless barbarity, its daring impiety,

clare to you, our brethren and natural allies, with the affection springing from our consanguinity, and with the respect due to the dignity of the alliance, but at the same time with the frankness of that Christian love which we would extend to every nation upon earth, that to uphold SLAVERY IS A CRIME BEFORE GOD: and if you wish to retain his favour, to propitiate his mercy, and to be blessed with his countenance and protection, either in your natural or individual enterprise, you also must forthwish abolish it, and for ever. In August 1834, I took farewell of Scotland, to embark for America, as a missionary, to preach these principles—to proclaim that "slavery is a crime before God, to be immediately and for ever abolished." My last address in Scotland was delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, where, before a large audience, consisting of persons of all religious denominations, I read the declaration of the Philadelphia Convention, and announced my intention to preach, in the name of Christian Scotland, the doctrines therein contained. I deem it but an act of bare justice to state, that in the year 1833, the Baptists of England addressed a faithful remonstrance to their brethren in America, on the subject of slavery. After reviewing the history of slavery in the West Indies, they say:—

"This state of things led us to examine the principles of our past conduct, and to inquire, with much diligence and prayer, what our future course should be. These inquiries issued in a deep conviction of the *unchristian* and inhuman character of the slave system, and a strong feeling of obligation to put forth all our energies to effect its speedy overthrow. *It appeared to us as a sin to be abandoned, and not an evil to be mitigated; a high crime against the Majesty of heaven,* for the suppression of which every believer in Christ was bound strenuously and prayerfully to labour.

"Influenced by these convictions, we took a decided part in the anti-slavery struggle lately carried on in this country, and are very thankful that by doing so we greatly contributed to its successful termination. *The principle we adopted was, the utter repugnance of the colonial system to the spirit and precepts of the Christian faith;* and we demanded of our legislature *its immediate and entire destruction.* Leaving to others the commercial and political bearings of the question, we felt it a sacred duty loudly to denounce negro slavery as *a palpable violation of the law of God.* The Christian population of Great Britain responded to our appeal as the heart of one man, and their conduct has been sanctioned by the blessing of heaven.

"We indulge the hope that you will seriously inquire whether, as the disciples of Jesus Christ, it is not your *imperative duty, without delay,* to raise your voices against the cruel and degrading bondage in which our African brethren and their descendants are held in various parts of your land. We wish to fix your attention on the system as a whole—its unchristian character, its degrading tendency, the misery it generates, the injustice, cruelty, and wretchedness it involves. *Is it not an awful breach of the divine law, a manifest infraction of that social compact which is always and everywhere binding?* And if it be so, are you not, as Christians, and especially as Christian ministers, bound to protest against it, and to seek, by all legitimate means, *its speedy and entire destruction?*"

After an absence of a year and a half, I returned to this country, and for three years was incessantly occupied in the work of unfolding the horrors of American slavery, and more especially the corrupt state of the American slaveholding churches. While in America, I deemed it my duty to censure the conduct of certain delegates from this country, who, in my judgment, failed in the discharge of their Christian duty on the subject of slavery, while in the United States. On my return, so far from being called to account by the bodies to whom these delegates belonged, I received the warm thanks of their Christian brethren, who showed the feeling with which they regarded their representatives, by their warm sympathy and co-operation with me. [Loud cheers.] I was permitted to stand before the Associate Synod of Scotland, and expose the slave-holding practices of the American Churches in the Southern States. I was permitted to stand before the Relief Synod, and do the same. Again, and again, I was invited by the Congregational Union of Scotland to do the same; and all these bodies, in conjunction with the Reformed Presbyterians, and the Associated Baptists of Scotland, adopted and forwarded to America, earnest and uncompromising remonstrances on the subject of slavery. [Hear and applause.] While such was the conduct of these religious denominations, did those who are now the leaders of the Free Church of Scotland adopt a different course? Did they protest against our views as

"ACKNOWLEDGED SLANDER" AGAIN!

FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLY

AND

SLAVERY,

CONTRASTED WITH

THE IRISH ASSEMBLY & SLAVERY;

AND

"ACKNOWLEDGED SLANDER"

AGAINST

MR. FREDERICK DOUGLASS,

BY

THE REV. DR. SMYTH, OF CHARLESTON.

REPRINTED FROM THE GLASGOW ARGUS.

GLASGOW:
GEORGE GALLIE, BUCHANAN STREET;
W. & R. SMEAL, 161, GALLOWGATE; QUENTIN DALRYMPLE
FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH,
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.
1846.

FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLY

AND

SLAVERY.

(*From the Toronto Banner, July* 3, 1846.)

We have passed by the proceedings of the Free Assembly from Saturday 23d to Saturday 30th May, in order that we might give the discussion on Slavery on the latter day.

Our latest Scotch papers come down to the 2d June, and the report we now give of Dr. Candlish's speech is abridged from the *Scottish Guardian* of that date. We make no apology for devoting so large a portion of our publication to the question of Domestic Slavery. It is the great question of the day, and, next to the preaching of the everlasting Gospel, demands the most serious attention of every man who feels for suffering humanity. Two millions and a half of human beings were pleading at the bar of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, on Saturday the 30th of May, through the petition of their eloquent and accomplished advocate, George Thompson, with what success our readers can judge. There was none to second the motion of the Rev. Mr. Macbeth, who had the high honour to stand alone in that vast Assembly in his noble effort in behalf of the slave, and in maintaining the character of his church. The memorials of the Synod of Sutherland and Caithness, of the Dundee congregation, and of the Anti-Slavery Society of Scotland, were rejected at the bar of the Free Church Assembly, but they have gone up to the Appeal Court of the Judge of All, where the pleader for the oppressed never pleads in vain.

The speech of Dr. Candlish is not in keeping with his high standing and well-earned reputation in the Christian world. He is not at home in the business he has undertaken. The Assembly, he says, has got the old school American Assembly's letter, and we have hints that it is on the whole a good letter—there are, at least, many good things in it, and some which are disapproved, but still the letter does not make its appearance. The Free Church Assembly had not yet had time to send an answer. That

answer was to be got up carefully, and some "circumlocution" was to be employed in drawing it. The worthy leader of the Free Church is not at home indeed. He has at his command many of the most able and gifted men of the day, ministers and laymen, whose very inmost thoughts have been expended to the delight and instruction of the world, while vindicating the rights of their church, and establishing its claims to the gratitude and admiration of the Christian world. A "mouth and wisdom" has never been withheld by the great "Master of Assemblies" when pleading the cause of Christ's Crown and Covenant, when refreshing the souls of their brethren from the sister kingdoms, from the Continent of Europe, and from the most distant parts of the habitable earth.—Out of "the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," but when the subject is alien to the feelings of the heart "circumlocution" takes the place of simple and natural eloquence. We venture to say, that to answer the old-school Assembly's Letter in the spirit of the proceedings of the 30th, and yet to appear opposed to slavery, will be as difficult a task as for the Established Assembly to answer the Protest of the Free Church of 1843, which has not been done to this day.

Dr. Candlish has fallen into the mistake of Dr. Cunningham, and others, in regard to the leading Presbyterian ministers of the States. *The latter have no dislike to slavery*, as their course of action has abundantly shown. They have never taken one step in favour of the slave during all the anti-slavery agitation of the last ten years. We speak not of the whole of them, but this is the course of the great majority. They never remonstrated when Texas was added to the Union. While the despised and maligned Abolitionists were pouring in their petitions against another Slave State being engrafted, did one of the many Doctors in Divinity breathe one word against the atrocious act? Not one of them. Speak to them singly, and they say—"We dislike slavery as much as you do," and then comes an ominous *but*—"but it is the law of the land, and we cannot meddle with it." Ah! if that were all, they would soon meddle with it, for there are keen Whigs, and keener Locofocos, among these gentlemen. That is not the reason. They have connexions in the South—they have merchants in their churches in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, intimately connected with the peculiar Institution, and they are dumb, and will not open their mouths for the slave. Press them about the truths of religion being kept back from the poor slaves, by laws prohibiting them from being taught to read, we are again told it is the law of the United States, and in such a way as if that law were superior to the law of God.

One thing these Reverend gentlemen all agree in, to pour the utmost possible abuse on the Abolitionists. If they are asked to join the Anti-Slavery, or Abolition Societies, they raise some frivolous objection about the individuals engaged in them, or the mode of their management. When they are told that by their junction they will improve the quality, both of the Societies and their management, they decline it—they will do nothing, but traduce and vilify the Abolitionists. When Lovejoy, a preacher of the Gospel, was murdered while defending his house and press

from the attack of a mob of *gentlemen*-ruffians at Alton, did one of these professed friends of the Slave interfere? Not one. When the generous and devoted Torrey was clapt into prison, and lingered for many months under the iron yoke of the Slaveholder, did one of them interfere? No. "Foolish man"—"Mistaken enthusiast!"—or, perhaps, "He richly deserved it"—was all that this martyr received from such quarters.

We speak from positive knowledge of the sentiments of many of these men. We observe with deep regret that the Free Church papers in Scotland speak in terms undeserved of the abolitionists of the States.

In every great and generous movement that has been made for the improvement of fallen man, men of an ardent and enthusiastic turn of mind have taken a part. But the cause is not to be estimated by the character of some of its followers, but by its own intrinsic merits. Some abolitionists are said to be infidels. This may be true, though we have never met any, but have met many pious and devoted men among them. But what has that to do with the cause of abolishing Slavery.

In the States nothing is doing to rouse the people but by the despised and reviled Abolitionists. The slave system is presented to the world in the present day by hundreds of poor men escaping from bondage, and many shot down in the attempt, by the enactment of more rigorous laws, and by ministers of the gospel murdered in the name of law for restoring their fellow men to liberty in a country which boasts itself as the only free one on earth. The world is in a more advanced stage since the abolition of slavery began to be agitated.

There is one great mistake into which Dr. Candlish has fallen from erroneous information, and on which his mode of dealing with the slaveholders is entirely founded. He admits that slaveholding is *prima facie* a sin; but he says, circumstances exist where it cannot be given up without committing a sin. This is, certainly, a most illogical statement. Slavery is a *sin*, and the slaveholder being convinced that it is so, he gives it up by setting his slaves free. Can the act of freeing a slave from bondage be sin? Assuredly not. It is an act of duty and obedience to the commandment of God, and it cannot therefore be sin. Dr. Candlish in designating it sin, we suppose, has reference to the atrocious law in some of the States, which prevents free coloured persons from living within their bounds. Consequently, if the owner frees them, they will be laid hold of by the authorities and sold again into slavery. Now, although there was no remedy for this, it would still be *sin* in the slaveholder to retain them. His business is to clear his own skirts of the crime, and leave the issue to Providence. If he and others were doing their duty to the slave by giving up all ownership, it is incalculable the effect it might have in the way of example to others. If by doing so, the operation of unjust laws should produce another evil, the sin does not lie at his door; but so long as he holds possession of the bodies of his fellow men, he lives in open defiance of the law of God. When the martyrs confessed Christ and were led to the stake or the scaffold, they were the innocent and unwilling cause of

grievous sin committed by their persecutors. If they had denied Christ the sin would have remained with themselves.

We have taken this view to show the fallacy of the argument employed by Dr. C.; but there is no need for placing it on that footing. A slaveholder can transport his slaves into a free state without hindrance, and give them their freedom, and there they will not be molested, except by labouring under certain social evils, arising from *caste*, which this singular free people delight to inflict on the coloured race. The Doctor's theory about asking the man what he thinks of himself, and rolling on him the burden of proving "that he is not a sinner," is a delusion. The mere fact of his retaining slaves is an evidence of guilt, for he would send them to a free State, if he were really sincere, and did not roll slavery "like a sweet morsel under the tongue."

In no part of his speech is the worthy divine more wide of the mark than that when he alludes to the purchase of the freedom of the slaves, and pledges his country and his church to do their part if twenty millions are wanted, as in the West Indies. The idea of purchase is hopeless. The value of the stolen men and women in the States has never been estimated by them below twelve hundred millions of dollars, or two hundred and forty millions sterling. They take them at five hundred dollars a-head, and nearly two millions and a half in number. When making this offer, the Doctor resumes all his natural fire and eloquence, but he makes no mention of compensation to the slaves. That was the great defect in the West India Abolition Bill. A large part of the price of freedom should have been paid to them, as a compensation for generations of oppression. The freedom of the American slaves will never be got by purchase.

But as sure as Christianity will be universal in the world, so sure will the chains of the slave be broken, for the one cannot happen till the other is accomplished. And the slave trade can never be abolished till slavery itself is rooted out from the earth. One whole quarter of the world is shut out from the blessings of Gospel light and civilization by the perpetual desolations of the slave trade. Slavery is a more dangerous enemy to Christian truth than superstition and idolatry. And why should the Free Church of Scotland be behind in this great cause or occupy an equivocal or doubting position. "Is this thy kindess to thy friend?" Her entrance into life as a Christian Church has indeed been glorious, and her progress great. The Lord God has been to her "a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night," and will she lag behind in doing battle against the most atrocious system ever devised in the history of our fallen race? It is impossible. The people of Scotland will not permit it.

II.

THE IRISH ASSEMBLY AND SLAVERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHER WHIG.

Dear Sir,—It would appear, from the subjoined extract from *The Glasgow Examiner*, that, with *The Witness*, *at least*, there is great uncertainty as to the amount, meaning, and intent of the remonstrance lately sent from the Irish Presbyterian Assembly to the American Churches. Now, for the sake of all whom it may concern, and especially that *The Witness*, or its Editor, may not lie under any mistake or misapprehension on this important point, I, as a member of Assembly, beg to inform the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause, that the unanimous expressed feeling of the Assembly was, that we can have no fellowship with slave-holding Churches, simply because slave-holding is man-stealing, and men-stealers are, in the Holy Scriptures, ranked among sinners of the worst description. If this had not been the feeling, Dr. Smyth, in his native town, would have been received, cordially and joyfully, into our Assembly.—By inserting the extract, you will oblige yours, truly,

Isaac Nelson.

Belfast, 3d August, 1846.

"Irish Presbyterianism *v.* Slaveholding Churches.—We direct attention to the deliverance of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland on this much-agitated and very vital question. That document bears the marks of honesty and intelligence, and contrasts strikingly with the milk-and-water, undecided and very complimentary effusion, which emanated from the Free Assembly, under the name of a remonstrance. The *Witness*, of Wednesday, attempts to set forth, as if the Irish decision were just the same with the Edinburgh one. They differ both in spirit and form. The Irish Assembly continues, indeed, to remonstrate, and to hold such friendly intercourse, as admits of Ministerial suggestions or reproof; but, besides the not inviting Doctor Smyth to a seat, the letter sent is in such decided and stringent terms (while respectful) as to leave no doubt that they regard slave-holding as a disqualification for communion—and its faithful monitory tone, if it does not provoke an anticipative esolution to quit terms with old Ireland, gives unequivocal

tokens that the American Churches abetting slavery are, and shall be, renounced as sister Churches, by Irish Presbyterians. A member of the Irish Assembly, communicating the decision to one of our own citizens, uses these words—confirmatory of the view we take of the Irish Assembly's document—'We can have no communion with a Church advocating the system of slavery. The Rev. Doctor Smyth, of Charleston, was not allowed to sit in our Assembly. The Free Church will be obliged to take a more Scriptural view of the whole question.'"

LETTER

FROM THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND,

TO THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Rev. and Dear Brethren,—Your communication, bearing date May 27, 1845, did not reach our Moderator until some time in the month of October last, and, consequently, was not submitted to our Assembly until its present annual meeting. The events which have occurred in the interval have dispelled many of the fears entertained when your letter was dictated. We praise the Lord that He has delivered us from the apprehension of an international war; and we trust that no circumstance may hereafter arise to disturb those friendly relations which two countries, bound together by so many ties, should assiduously cultivate. What a motive have we, dear brethren, to labour with increasing zeal in the advancement of our common Christianity when we consider that it is connected with peace on earth, as well as glory to God in the highest! Have we not reason to believe that the friends of true religion here and in America have had some influence in inducing statesmen to enter into pacific arrangements? and are we not warranted to hope that, as the spirit of the Gospel spreads, the spirit of contention will disappear? . . . . We have noticed with much pleasure the frankness and good feeling which you manifest when alluding to our remonstrances on the subject of slavery. It is the duty of churches, as well as of individuals, to admonish and advise each other in the spirit of gentleness, and to receive with meekness admonitions which are so tendered. We pretend to no superiority, and assume no

authority over our brethren in America, but we feel it to be our duty, on the present occasion, to take the liberty in all kindness of expressing more fully our views of the American slave system.

You appear proud of the liberty which the inhabitants of the United States enjoy, and you quote what has been called the golden rule of doing to others as we would that, in like circumstances, they should do to us. Permit us, then, to ask, when your own hearts are buoyant with the triumphant feeling of conscious liberty, what must be the bitter experience of the poor slave in America, who is as much the property of his master as his ox or his ass, and who has no liberty, but to submit, suffer, and obey? And how would his master feel were he to be treated as the kindest master treats his slave? "Men-stealers" are classed in the Divine Word with murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers; and we cordially adopt the declaration, that "men-stealers" are "all those who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it."

You say that you would not, "by any means, countenance the traffic in slaves for the sake of gain," and you repudiate the idea that masters may regard their servants as mere property. Does not this acknowledgment imply that you are bound, "as far as in you lies," to seek the immediate abolition of slavery in the country which you boast as the land of unrivalled freedom?

You refer to defective and oppressive laws; and it has been asserted by the advocates of those enactments that the teaching of slaves to read, and especially the Holy Book of God, or the placing of the institution of marriage among them on the permanent footing on which our Lord places it, would be subversive of the whole American slave system.

You declare that you do not countenance the enormities to which your civil code lends its sanction; but we pray you to consider whether you acknowledge as Christians those who commit them. Is any one admitted to your fellowship who keeps possession of a slave, of whom he has obtained possession, directly or indirectly, by the crime of man-stealing? Is any admitted, who, in obedience to any laws, withholds from his slave or servant the use of the Holy Scriptures or Christian instruction—who does not merely fail to put the Bible into his hands, or to teach him the Gospel, but who, in obedience to an unrighteous enactment, interposes between him and the Bible, or those who would instruct him? Is any man recognised as a Christian brother who has separated husbands and wives, parents and children; or who even holds slaves on such a footing, that if God were to remove him by death, the members of families thus intimately related would be exposed to compulsory separation? We are persuaded that our Lord and His Apostles would not have acknowledged as disciples those who, under any name or pretence, were guilty of such wickedness.

We know that when attempts were made under the plea of law, to prevent the apostles from preaching the Gospel to any individual, they avowed it as their determination to "obey God rather than men." We conceive, therefore, that whatever may be the law of any state or country, no Christian ought to hold in

forcible servitude any one of whom he has obtained possession, directly or indirectly, by the crime of man-stealing; that no member of the church ought to interpose his authority to withhold religious instruction and the use of the Divine Word from any human being; that no consistent professor of the Gospel should hold his brother man in bondage under circumstances in which he might be forcibly separated from his wife and children; and we conceive that no church should hold communion with those who are guilty of such violations, alike of the laws of nature and of revelation.

You say, dear brethren, that you do not approve of such slavery and such laws connected with it as are to be found in your country. We conceive that declarations of this description will be of no avail if you admit to Christian privileges any who support by their practice such cruel and unscriptural enactments; and we would suggest that your duty is to institute an inquiry into the conduct of the slave proprietors at present attached to your denomination, and should it be found that they withhold from those over whom American law has given over them such unwarrantable power, anything that is just and equal, that you should deal with them as with any other class of habitual sinners.

We are constrained to express our apprehension that, perhaps, in consequence of a measure of imprudence on the part of some who have been advocating the abolition of slavery, you are in much danger of falling into the temptation of espousing the cause of slaveholders. We observe, with regret, that your reprobation of the alleged errors of the abolitionists is much stronger than your condemnation of those who are seeking to perpetuate the accursed system of American bondage. You thus seem inclined to cast the chief blame of the continuance of the acknowledged evils of slavery, as it exists in your country, upon the only persons who are making any vigorous efforts for their extinction. We, who live at a distance, find it very difficult to believe that, not the slaveholder, but those who are aiming at the extinction of the system, are to be blamed for the continuance of it in its unmitigated severity. We greatly apprehend that your defence of slavery or servitude, in the abstract, accompanied with your feeble reprehension of its admitted enormities, is much more likely to retard its abolition or mitigation than any amount of violence or imprudence on the part of those who seek its removal.

You tell us of your missions to the heathens, and we rejoice in their magnitude and success; but, dear brethren, how inconsistent to seek to bring into the liberty of God's children heathen at a distance, and keep so many in a state of deplorable heathenism at home?

We think it right, in conclusion, to say, dear brethren, that we have ventured to express ourselves to you on this subject with the utmost freedom. We trust, however, that you will receive our observations in the spirit in which they have been dictated. We believe there are many among you at whose feet we would feel it to be a privilege to sit, and to receive instruction. You have pastors in your assembly whose praise is in all the churches, and whose works have been read with pleasure and

profit throughout Protestant Christendom. We cannot forget that in many respects you have rendered the most important services to the cause of Christianity, and we are, therefore, the more solicitous that everything pertaining to you should be lovely and of good report. As you are partakers of the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, we are the more anxious that slavery in every form should disappear from your borders, and we have, therefore, written to you in the fulness of our hearts. We are desirous that our intercourse should prove a mutual blessing, and should you feel it necessary to expostulate with ourselves as to anything with respect to which you conceive we are walking contrary to the Gospel, we trust that we shall be ever prepared to give due consideration to your friendly counsel.

Signed in the name, and by the authority, of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland,

JAMES MORGAN, Moderator.
THOMAS MAYNE REID, A.M. Senior Clerk of Assembly.
ROBERT PARK, A.M. Junior Clerk.

Belfast, July 11, 1846.

III.

ACKNOWLEDGED SLANDER

AGAINST

MR. FREDERICK DOUGLASS,

BY THE

REV. DR. SMYTH, OF CHARLESTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN WHIG.

SIR,—The Rev. Dr. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, South Carolina, who lately visited Belfast, made certain statements, injurious to the moral and religious character of Mr. Frederick Douglass, the fugitive slave. These statements being calculated to injure his usefulness, Mr. Douglass felt himself compelled, for the sake of his brethren in bonds, and in justice to the Belfast Anti-Slavery Society, who invited him to this town, and especially to prevent others from defending slavery, or shielding its abettors, by calumniating him, to call upon the rev. gentleman to come forward, and make a full and public apology, or abide the legal consequences of refusal. Messrs. Davison and Torrens, solicitor

on behalf of Mr. Douglass, demanded this apology from Dr. Smyth, intimating, at the same time, that in case of refusal, he must abide the issue of a civil action, which would afford him abundant opportunity to prove (if he could) the truth of his assertions.

Mr. Douglass, conscious of innocence, took this manly and fearless mode of procedure, rather than the more usual one of filing a criminal information, which would hinder the party complained against from putting in a plea of justification.

I have the pleasure of handing you, by desire of Mr. Douglass (who is now in England), a copy of Doctor Smyth's letter of apology, with which Mr. Douglass's Solicitors advised him to rest satisfied, as his only object was the vindication of principle and character, and not any consideration of a pecuniary nature. This transaction, Sir, is a noble illustration of the spirit of British law, which, as Curran said, makes justice commensurate with and inseparable from British soil, which proclaims, even to the stranger, the moment he sets his foot on our shore, that the ground is consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES STANDFIELD.

Belfast, 7th August, 1846.

[COPY.]

DUBLIN, July 28, 1846.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your letter of the 16th instant, informing me that you had been instructed by Mr. Frederick Douglass, the Anti-Slavery lecturer, to institute proceedings at law against me, for certain statements made by me injurious to his moral and religious character, I beg to express my sincere regret for having uttered the same; the more especially as, upon mature reflection, I am quite satisfied that the statements I incautiously made, on the report of third parties, were unfounded.—Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOMAS SMYTH.

Messrs. Davison & Torrens.

PRINTED BY J. CLARK, 25, QUEEN STREET, GLASGOW.